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1 Executive summary

When London bid to host the 2012 Paralympic Games and Olympic Games the then Mayor and Government saw it as a once-in-a-generation opportunity to deliver a sustainable legacy for one of the most deprived areas of the UK and London. East London, a place where employment, life chances, urban quality and amenity did not match up with London's average, was firmly catapulted onto the world stage.

The 2012 Programme stakeholders set an impressive suite of sustainability targets under five key themes and these have driven excellent outcomes on the Olympic Park and beyond in the Lower Lea Valley, and across the UK. Nationally, the picture is also good, with some new venues being created or enhanced and programmes to engage people in the spirit of the Games and its legacy. We have focused this review however, on East London given the bulk of expenditure has occurred there and its prominent place in London’s bid.

The Olympic and Paralympic legacy in any city is a unique opportunity that must be grasped if it is to truly make a lasting difference. Yet, the UK, like the rest of the globe, has experienced a prolonged economic downturn. Less than optimal economic conditions, and the necessary restructuring of key Games stakeholders including the wind-up of LOCOG and the ODA, create a degree of uncertainty going forward. Against each of the sustainability themes, while progress is generally good, there is still more to be implemented, and some challenges to be overcome with respect to healthy living and waste infrastructure in particular. In this we believe there is a danger that achievement of legacy objectives may drift off-course if care is not taken to make sure they remain responsive, strategic and targeted.

The vision for legacy was set out in 2004 and a lot has changed since then, both in terms of the level of achievement within the 2012 Programme, and of course in the broader political and policy landscape. We have recommended that Games bodies and East London stakeholders seize the moment to refresh the vision for legacy, drawing on the extraordinary successes of the programme to date, and considering how this legacy can be best protected and optimised. In particular, we have suggested that the approach to the physical regeneration of the Olympic Park and sections of the Lower Lea, could be extended the length of the river valley with deep sustainability gains to be made over a 30 year timeframe. We believe that the Lea ecological system offers extraordinary opportunities to London’s industry and communities which, if grasped, could make a significant contribution to the green economy, healthy living, biodiversity, climate change and socio-economic convergence objectives. Such a transformation would point the way of the future for cities in adapting to a leaner, cleaner, greener and more equitable world.

To support the development of this refreshed vision, we have recommended that a community of practice come together to make the pragmatic links that are necessary for such a vision to be grounded in reality, and to bring the local leadership that is required for this process to have currency amongst businesses, third sector agencies and local communities.

The Park legacy is a particular focus of this review, and we have approached this from a governance perspective as its future is still highly dependent upon the quality and commitment of the legacy agency going forward. The legacy for the Olympic Park has evolved from nascent plans drawn up by the London Development Agency through to the establishment of the Olympic
Park Legacy Company and the soon to be established London Legacy Development Corporation. In the past we have been highly critical of the extent to which sustainability was incorporated into delivery plans for legacy on the Park. We are pleased to report that the Olympic Park Legacy Company’s plans are now strong after a slow start. The evidence is now beginning to show that it is able to deliver above expectations. We hope the organisation takes heed of these successes and confidently continues to explore what more can be done to make Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park a world-leading exemplar of sustainable living.

London will have hosted the Games three times by the time 2012 draws to a close. Each time there have been innovations but arguably it is these Games that not only set the benchmark for the future, but also put London on show like never before. The physical legacy is for all to see but the contribution of the 2012 Programme to new ways of making things happen has also been second to none. We have highlighted a series of policies and programmes which make a substantial contribution to industry, and to sustainable events management. One particular area where we have recommended that more could be done is for the lessons for sustainable procurement to be assessed and embedded at London and national levels. We have also recommended that LOCOG’s sizeable contribution to moving forward the sustainable events industry be widely available beyond the Games.

From our own perspective, we believe that the very act of creating an independent assurance body to oversee the Games programme continues to be world-leading. This Commission appropriately ends on 31st March 2013 but its own legacy is worth further consideration. We have recommended that the Greater London Authority consider the value of strategic assurance for major projects in London going forward.
2 Summary of recommendations

1. That key East London organisations including LVRPA, OPLC, Host Boroughs, Westfield, Triathlon Homes, Natural England, British Waterways, the Environment Agency, and third sector bodies come together to formulate a community of practice and a critical path for meeting wider legacy aspirations and initiatives and to ensure these remain on-task, coordinated and deliver optimum benefit.

2. That a key priority for the community of interest group (Recommendation 1) is to commission the development of a future-proofing strategy for the entire Lea Valley, that actively identifies and removes road-blocks to the whole river-valley becoming a single sustainable urban, green infrastructure system with enhanced economic, social and environmental outcomes and amenity. The development of the strategy should be undertaken by an appropriate agency or partnership on behalf of the coordination group and should take account of the convergence agenda.

3. That OPLC/LLDC builds on its good work by demonstrating publicly how it is embedding, resourcing and reporting on environmental and socio-economic sustainability throughout its core business by the end of April 2012.

4. That LOCOG, with appropriate support from Government, creates its own learning legacy that can be shared publicly beyond the IOC family to the events industry more broadly so as to optimise the public and private sector investment in the 2012 Games and its impact on major events in the UK and worldwide.

5. That the GOE publicly detail how its 2012 programmes, initiatives and funding will be managed into legacy, prior to the commencement of the Games period.

6. That the Government make fully transparent how it is meeting its commitment to improve sports participation across its range of funded programmes (and how resources and programme structures have been realigned to achieve this).

7. That Government, through appropriate interdepartmental mechanisms, agree a way to ensure that sustainable procurement principles and mechanisms are considered as part of government buying guidance and other relevant frameworks.

8. That the GLA develop an internal process and identify a suitable resource to collate, synthesise and implement lessons learnt from the 2012 Programme to ensure that the Group continues to lead in sustainable procurement, waste policy, food policy and other relevant functions.

9. That the GLA put in place mechanisms to consider whether a potential future model for strategic sustainability assurance could be of benefit for London, potentially with regard to major projects.
Previous recommendations reiterated in this report

Annual Review 2008
- The LDA [now OPLC] should assess the resources required to embed sustainability into the Legacy Master plan Framework and to act as an effective client. These resources should be deployed as permanent staff at a senior level where possible.

Carbon Review 2009
- Each individual Key Stakeholder should be responsible for reducing or avoiding emissions within their area of responsibility. The Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 has a responsibility to assure this activity.
- The reference footprint should be recalculated and published on a regular basis. Assumptions should be explicitly stated to ensure openness and transparency.

Design Review 2009
- That sustainability specialists are involved in the evaluation of design-related tenders to ensure that the relevant issues are considered at an early stage.

Annual Review 2009
- That there is greater co-ordination of the healthy living agenda across Key Stakeholders, through existing groups, or possibly by establishing a Health Legacy board as part of the legacy governance structure. (This is the responsibility of GOE and the GLA).
- That the London 2012 Sustainability Group ensures that all healthy living commitments in the London 2012 Sustainability Plan are being actively monitored and progressed.
- That LOCOG, the British Olympic Association and the British Paralympic Association maximise the legacy of the Get Set programme and find partners to achieve this.
- That LOCOG continue to explore opportunities with legacy owners and the sport community to ensure the optimum long term benefit is achieved in lease/buy decisions.

Biodiversity Review 2010
- That the habitats that are developed in legacy are in line with the habitat commitments set out in the Olympic Park Biodiversity Action Plan, providing a mix of appropriate accessible, natural habitats.
- That the body or bodies responsible for the Olympic Park in legacy set out and implement clear plans for how the habitat will be maintained, managed and monitored to ensure that a minimum of 45 ha of SINC of at least Borough Grade 1 standard develops within the Olympic Park.
- That the ODA review existing procedures and controls to ensure they are suitable for managing the habitats during Park Operations and Transformation. This needs to ensure that the habitats and species present on the Park are safeguarded, protected and enhanced and that the biodiversity of the Park is monitored during these phases.

Food Review 2010
- The OPLC should develop detailed design guidance for developers on how to incorporate food growing into their development plots, along the lines of the guidance developed for the South East False Creek in Vancouver, site of the 2010 Winter Games Athlete’s Village. This could be applied more widely to other developments in London by the GLA.
Future development in the Olympic Park, led by the OPLC, should follow the example of the Athletes Village for which there is a draft Food Strategy that can be implemented over time as the homes are occupied and if the community demonstrates an interest in growing their own food. This would ensure that the development is future proofed and can enable food growing to be ‘retrofitted’. This should also include facilities to make it easy for residents and businesses to access healthy and sustainable food.

**Waste Review 2010**

- That the London 2012 Sustainability Group set out how the management of waste and resources in the post-Games bump-out/breakdown phase and subsequent transformation phase will be co-ordinated and where responsibility will lie. This encompasses the operations of City Operations, HMG, LOCOG and the ODA and how they will all maximise reuse of materials. This needs to:
  - include how responsibility for the end use of temporary materials, demolition and construction materials will be coordinated;
  - have as its main objective the sale and reuse of these materials, including setting a specific target for reuse, then the recycling and recovery of materials, according to the optimal option in carbon terms for the specific item or material;
  - take reasonable endeavors to reuse or recycle at least 90 per cent, by weight, of the material arising from the installation and deconstruction of temporary venues, equipment and overlay;
  - be set out as soon as possible in order to be able to influence decisions relating to all operational aspects, including logistics, transport, regulatory compliance, security, and health and safety;
  - report on progress and present a final report to the Olympic Board or relevant responsible body at the end of the entire operation.

- That the London Development Agency, through the London Waste and Recycling Board, fund additional new commercially viable waste management facilities for the processing of organic waste in East London that are fully operational by Games-time. The Commission's view is that this needs to be achieved in a critical window to 30 June 2010 in order to have any chance of being operational for Games-time. [This recommendation builds on and takes forward earlier recommendations in the 2007 and 2008 Annual Reviews]

- That the Olympic Park Legacy Company develops an integrated waste and energy strategy for the legacy developments on the Olympic Park. This should use organic waste to derive biogas and maximise the renewable energy available to the legacy communities and facilities, with the ultimate aim of creating an exemplar zero carbon community in the Lower Lea Valley. Local employment opportunities should be considered as part of this strategy. [This recommendation builds on and takes forward earlier recommendations in the 2007 and 2008 Annual Reviews]

- That the Olympic Delivery Authority reports separately on each of the three components of the construction waste target, being the proportions and tonnage of construction waste reused, recycled, or recovered; and that this also is done for the organisations responsible for subsequent phases of the London 2012 Programme.
3 Preamble

3.1. When London agreed to host the 1948 summer Olympic Games it did so in an age of austerity. With the devastations of World War II still fresh, and the economic reality of a country completely spent, the focus was firmly on staging a morale-boosting event, relying upon existing venues as the most cost-effective means to do so. In 2012, London is again experiencing an austere time, but unlike in 1946, Games organisers upon winning the right to host the 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, did not know that they would be faced with a looming global economic crisis the size of which is only comparable to the Great Depression.

3.2. This review focuses on whether the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Programme will deliver a sustainable legacy, and whether it will deliver on its legacy commitments. The global financial crisis which hit in 2007 and which has resulted in a prolonged global economic downturn, has fundamentally changed the financial and economic policy landscape within the UK and abroad. Amidst these challenging times, there has never been any suggestion that the 2012 Games should not proceed, nor that any major commitments be withdrawn. This is a testament to central, regional and local governments and the London 2012 Programme partners despite considerable budgetary pressures. Yet, the impact of the global economic downturn on wider legacy outcomes is not able to be so easily held at bay. It is not possible within the scope of this review to measure this, but it would be unwise for this review to ignore the potential for such potent forces to impact on outcomes in East London, Greater London and the UK as a whole. The view of many sustainability thinkers is that it is precisely times like these that present a unique opportunity to embrace an economic re-engineering of our production and consumption cycles so that truly sustainable economic models can take root. These could offer a realistic alternative to outdated models of growth which tend not to internalise environmental or social costs. East London and the Lea Valley offer the spatial and planning plane for a genuine and concerted sustainable economy but it will not happen without some investment and incentivisation.

3.3. The evidence from past Games demonstrates that legacy aspirations have had mixed fortunes whether in good or bad economic times. Few Games’ legacies have truly been successful, but cities that have managed to grow benefit from hosting the Games, have embedded city regeneration at the heart of their Games planning. London has always promoted the regenerative benefits of its Games Programme as its central commitment to legacy. Inasmuch, London is on firm footing for being able to translate aspiration into a real and lasting legacy for East London and Greater London more broadly. This review will consider the extent to which these opportunities have been optimised.

4 Aim of the review

4.1. A primary reason the former Mayor of London and UK Government bid (with cross party support) for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games was to focus physical, social and economic investment on East London and broader economic benefits to the UK. The once-in-a-generation opportunity to address chronic disadvantage being experienced in this area of London was integral to the UK bid. The Games Programme has reflected this strong legacy focus, and a number of significant commitments have been made to ensure there is a long-lasting and sustainable legacy. Previous Games have, by and large, not been successful in demonstrating an effective, holistic and long-lasting legacy for communities, the facilities or the domestic economy of host nations.

4.2. The Commission’s lifespan is only until March 2013 and this leaves a very small window for finalising its work and reviews. This makes it most important that effective assurance of the London 2012 Programme plans and preparations for legacy is undertaken in time to influence procurement, design, physical works immediately post-Games, and longer term environmental, social and economic regeneration objectives. The Commission has already commented on elements of legacy preparation, but this review will be the first time the Commission has directly addressed the question of legacy through a discreet review.

4.3. The aims of the legacy review are as follows:

- To review the progress in preparing to deliver on legacy sustainability commitments, aims and objectives;
- To provide assurance over the extent to which the relevant bodies are on track for delivery;
- To identify successes and good practice where there could be a learning legacy; and
- To make recommendations where appropriate.

The structure of the review addresses background, overarching governance, organisational governance and then each of the five sustainability themes. Inclusion has been addressed as a cross-cutting theme as it impacts on design, employment and skills, and healthy living.
5  Defining a sustainable legacy

5.1. The Olympic Charter includes in its mission: ‘to promote a positive legacy from the Olympic Games to the host cities and host countries’. This legacy commitment was inserted into the Olympic Charter in 2002 in recognition of the need for the Games to bequeath long-lasting tangible benefits both to the host city and the host country – here, London and the UK.

5.2. During the bid process, the London Bid Committee placed legacy at the heart of its ambitions for a London Games. The bid highlighted four main themes, these included: ‘creating a legacy to transform sport in London’ and ‘regenerating East London communities and their environment’. This constituted long term focus of London’s vision for the 2012 Games. The other two strands of the vision were the athlete experience and supporting the Olympic Movement.

5.3. The sporting legacy was primarily centred on new sporting venues that could host national and international legacy. Increased sports participation across the UK was expected to be generated from the sporting momentum and the successes from the Games. Specific programmatic interventions were later developed to complement this core vision. Benefiting the community through regeneration was much more geographically specific. The bid highlighted the creation of a new Olympic Park in the Lower Lea Valley in East London. Explicitly, the staging of the Games was linking to ‘the regeneration of an entire community for the direct benefit of everyone who lives there’. The Olympic Park was to act as ‘a catalyst for profound social and economic change’. Furthermore, it would become a model of social inclusion, with opportunities relating to education, cultural and skills development, and jobs. These new opportunities would accrue to ‘people across the UK and London, but especially in the Lea Valley and surrounding areas’. New sporting facilities would be open to all, not just elite athletes. This would enable more people to participate in sport and physical activity ultimately leading to ‘a fitter society and reducing health inequalities’.

5.4. The legacy impacts of the 2012 Games were specifically identified in the Bid under four headings: sport, community, environment and the economy. The stated sport legacy consisted of the new Olympic Stadium, Aquatics Centre, VeloPark, Hockey Centre, and Indoor Sports Centre. The community legacy focussed on healthy living and inclusion for the most disadvantaged in the Lea Valley and East London, including employment and skills opportunities. The Olympic Village would become a new community with 3,600 new residential units. The environmental legacy was broadly construed to include enhancing greenspace, promoting sustainable travel as well as the promotion of green technology. Taken together, this was seen as significant progress for the Olympic Movement towards the objectives set out in Towards a One Planet Olympic Games. The economic legacy identified 7,000 new full time jobs in the construction industry, with a further 12,000 jobs created as a result of the legacy developments. But it also stated that ‘the biggest economic legacy from the Games will be the creation of wider employment opportunities and improvements in the education, skills and knowledge of the local labour force in an area of very high unemployment’.

---

3 London 2012 Candidature File, Vol.1, Theme 1, p.16.
5.5. Sustainable infrastructure and integrated design strategies were separately identified. There was an implied legacy impact regarding long-term resource efficiency throughout the Olympic Park and surrounding areas. There was a commitment to a high degree of self-sufficiency in energy, water supply and waste management. Furthermore, it was recognised that to be truly sustainable, a sports venue had to become ‘an integral part of a thriving community’.6

5.6. The Host City Contract between the International Olympic Committee and the Mayor, British Olympic Association and LOCOG binds the signatory parties to ‘honour all commitments undertaken by the Government and such authorities in relation to the planning, organization and staging of the Games’.7 This is referred to as the ‘covenant of the Government’ and encompasses regional and local government bodies. The sustainability and legacy commitments were explicitly taken forward through the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Sustainable Development Policy signed on 28th June 2006 by the Secretary of State for Culture Media and Sport, the Mayor of London and the Chairs of LOCOG and the BOA. The commitments were further elaborated in the ODA's Sustainable Development Strategy (2007) and the subsequent London 2012 Sustainability Plan (2007 & 2009). The headline elements relating to legacy are shown in the table. However, it should be borne in mind that the London 2012 Commitments Register lists many hundreds of individual commitments relating to legacy. In 2007 and early 2008, both HM Government and the Mayor of London published legacy commitment publications. These both identified five themes, that included the transformation of East London. The Coalition Government published a new legacy publication in December 2010. However, this publication did drop the wording of the previous Government’s commitment to making the Olympic Park a ‘blueprint for sustainable living’.

Table 1 London 2012 Commitments to Legacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidature File – Volume I Theme 1 Concept and Legacy (2005)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ A legacy for sport: ‘The 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games will provide an opportunity to deliver much-needed sports infrastructure for the UK – and London in particular.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ A legacy for the community: ‘Staging the Olympic Games in the Lea Valley will stimulate a vital economic regeneration programme in London’s poorest and most disadvantaged area.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ A legacy for the environment: ‘The Olympic Park will create a high quality environment for the neighbouring mixed-use communities. It will enhance the amount and quality of greenspace, promote sustainable travel, conserve local biodiversity and wetlands, and improve air, soil and water quality.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ A legacy for the economy: ‘The biggest economic legacy from the Games will be the creation of wider employment opportunities and improvements in the education, skills and knowledge of the local labour force in an area of very high unemployment.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Host City Contract of the XXX Olympiad in 2012, s.5.
- This total Games phase will offer unparalleled opportunities to plan for minimising the potential impact of the event itself, to increase public awareness of the positive links between sport, environment and healthy living, and to create sustainable legacy communities.

- Respect for the planet’s ecological limits and encouragement for the best possible sustainable lifestyle leading towards One Planet Living.
- The celebration of our cultural diversity and the creation of a legacy for sport, the environment and the local, national and global community.
- The development of thriving communities in and around the Olympic Park site in East London with new economic, educational, health, sporting and cultural opportunities, set with an ecological Parkland and supported by resource efficient infrastructure and utilities.
- A renaissance of sport in the UK, engaging young people in participatory sport.
- Climate Change – the Games can make a real difference by minimising greenhouse gas emissions, from construction to legacy, and by ensuring that legacy facilities are able to cope with the impacts of climate change.
- Waste – London 2012 is committed to minimising construction waste, will send no waste produced during the Games to landfill, and will act as a catalyst for encouraging the development of new waste processing infrastructure in east London and promoting changes in public attitudes and behaviour.
- Biodiversity – London 2012 will minimise the impact of the Games on the ecology of the Lower Lea Valley and at other Games venues during the planning construction and operational phases; it will leave a legacy of enhanced habitats within the Olympic Park; and will foster an understanding of the importance of biodiversity in supporting healthy lifestyles.
- Inclusion – the Games will be genuinely open to all, will promote inclusion and attitude change, especially towards disability, celebrate the diversity of the people of London and the UK, and will create new employment, training and business opportunities, contributing to the social and economic regeneration of communities living around the Olympic Park site and the wider Lower Lea Valley.
- Healthy Living – the Games will be used to inspire people across the country to take up sport and develop active, healthy and sustainable lifestyles.

ODA Sustainable Development Strategy (2007)
- The ODA’s mission is to ‘deliver venues, facilities and infrastructure and transport on time and in a way that maximises the delivery of a sustainable legacy within the available budget’.
- The ODA is committed to providing sustainable legacy plans for the Park and venues, and to devise and implement effective transport plans which provide for legacy use. Once the Games are over, the ODA will be responsible for decommissioning the Olympic and Paralympic facilities to their legacy transformation state, including the remodelling of the Olympic Park.
Mayor of London’s Five Legacy Commitments (2007)
1. Increasing opportunities for Londoners to become involved in sport.
2. Ensuring Londoners benefit from new jobs, business and volunteering opportunities.
3. Transforming the heart of east London.
4. Delivering a sustainable Games and developing sustainable communities.
5. Showcasing London as a diverse, creative and welcoming city.

HM Government – Before During and After the Games (2007)
1. To make the UK a world-leading sporting nation.
2. To transform the heart of east London.
3. To inspire a new generation of young people to take part in local volunteering, cultural and physical activity.
4. To make the Olympic Park a blueprint for sustainable living.
5. To demonstrate the UK is a creative, inclusive and welcoming place to live in, visit and for business.

HM Government – Plans For The Legacy from the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games (2010)
1. Harnessing the United Kingdom’s passion for sport to increase grass roots participation, particularly by young people – and to encourage the whole population to be more physically active.
2. Exploiting to the full the opportunities for economic growth offered by hosting the Games.
3. Promoting community engagement and achieving participation across all groups in society through the Games.
4. Ensuring that the Olympic Park can be developed after the Games as one of the principal drivers of regeneration in East London.

Table 2 Towards a One Planet Olympics – Legacy Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zero Carbon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ Athletes’ Village capable of being energy self-sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Distributed network of heating, cooling and power serving local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Energy efficient sports venues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zero Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ Zero waste policies extend across East London based on high recycling rates and residual waste converted to compost and renewable energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Increased market for recycled products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Closed-loop waste management to be standard practice for major sports events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ Increased connectivity across and between legacy developments and neighbouring communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Reduced car dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Local and Sustainable Materials | - Reclaimed, recycled and local construction materials used during transformation into legacy mode  
|                               | - Training and job opportunities locally in (re)manufacturing            
|                               | - Local and sustainable materials supply chains maintained                 |
| Local and Sustainable Food    | - Increased markets for farmers in the region                              
|                               | - Markets, catering and retail outlets supplying local and seasonal food  
|                               | - Composting facilities integrated into closed-loop food strategy         |
| Sustainable Water             | - Long-term sustainable water supply and management                        
|                               | - Water efficient homes and infrastructure                                 
|                               | - Lower Lea Valley self-sufficient in water                                
|                               | - Ongoing management of waterways to provide amenity and wildlife habitat |
| Natural Habitats and Wildlife | - Net gain of ecologically valuable green space                           
|                               | - Biodiversity an integral component of urban and Park environment         
|                               | - People have greater local access to nature                              
|                               | - Lea Valley ‘green corridor’ connected to River Thames                   |
| Culture and Heritage          | - Creation of a vibrant and diverse legacy community                      
|                               | - Local and traditional industries revived to create employment and sense of identity  
|                               | - Ongoing development and management of legacy community to include public and stakeholder consultation |
| Equity and Fair Trade         | - High proportion of affordable housing                                   
|                               | - Mixed-use development to create sense of community                      
|                               | - Opportunities for local employment and education                         
|                               | - ‘Green’ business hub                                                     
|                               | - Fairtrade community status achieve                                      |
| Health and Happiness          | - Healthy internal environments in homes and other facilities             
|                               | - Improved air quality, visual amenity and soundscape                      
|                               | - Community facilities to provide healthcare, vocational training and other support structures  
|                               | - Legacy community management and support structures to facilitate         
|                               | - long-term sustainable living                                             |
5.7 The Host Boroughs have also contributed substantially to a vision for East London, having developed the Strategic Regeneration Framework in 2009 which sets out a number of principles towards achieving socio-economic convergence with the rest of London. This is covered in more detail in section 14.

5.8 The range of legacy commitments, goals and vision statements, while largely consistent, deserve to be unified once more into a single, embracing concept that can be endorsed by all the Key Stakeholders engaged in the businesses of transforming East London into a more sustainable place to live, work and play. We address this proposal in greater detail under legacy governance section 8.
## 6 Benchmarking legacy commitments against previous Games

Table 3 provides an overview of the way in which key themes were addressed at selected previous summer Games. NB: Information is sourced from evaluations and commentary on each Games and is intended to be an overview only.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Beijing</th>
<th>Athens</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Barcelona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New or improved transport links/ infrastructure</td>
<td>Target for a 100% public transport Games (with the exception of blue badge holders who will have private/hire vehicular access). Significant improvements to rail and bus infrastructure.</td>
<td>Target to complete 4th and 5th ring road, five new subway lines.</td>
<td>General improvements to city public transport system including new eco-busses, new metro line, tram lines and a new international airport.</td>
<td>New spur line to the Park. Runs infrequently and new master plan is heavily car-reliant.</td>
<td>Restructuring the railway network including removing railway barriers to seafront. Improvement of road network and creation of ring roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive design</td>
<td>All venues designed along inclusive design principles</td>
<td>Venues were designed to contemporary standards</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>Statutory requirements for disability access met for all venues</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of new neighbourhood or revitalisation of existing</td>
<td>Regeneration of the Lower Lea Valley in East London is at the heart of the bid. Existing plans fast-tracked by leading developer Westfield following bid-win.</td>
<td>Wholesale redevelopment of large portions of the inner city and relocation of many thousands of families to purpose accommodation in the suburbs. New hospitality and sporting facilities.</td>
<td>Siting of Olympic venues was dependent on available land, not overall revitalisation strategy.</td>
<td>A new city is planned 10 years after the Games. Olympic village became a new suburb.</td>
<td>Establishment of four strategic zones of investment which catalysed strategic urban projects. Regeneration of seafront land and opening up of over 40km of sea-front to the city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Energy and carbon & climate change adaptation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Beijing</th>
<th>Athens</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Barcelona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewable energy infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Renewable energy target not met due to technical failure of proposed technology for the site. However, compensatory measures in place and exceeded.</td>
<td>Commitment to install geothermal heating network to cover 16 million square metres. A number of venues fitted with geothermal, water source and air sourced heat pumps and solar PV systems.</td>
<td>No solar PV incorporated into venues. Conventional design approach to all venues. No water saving measures.</td>
<td>Olympic village and some venues including solar PV as well as passive solar design. New wetlands assist with cc adaptation although this was not their stated purpose. Extensive water saving measures including a blackwater treatment plant (WRAMS) which also provides renewable energy</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carbon reductions</strong></td>
<td>Carbon reductions of 50% on operation of venues in legacy use has been exceeded (although this has only been possible through off-site solutions)</td>
<td>Higher taxes imposed on larger vehicles. 90% of buses and 70% of taxis to use natural gas.</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air quality</strong></td>
<td>Target for an average 30% reduction in congestion through increased walking and cycling and increased use of public transport.</td>
<td>Closure of heavy steel mill in the city. Reduction in number of older vehicles on the roads. Restrictions on Games-time vehicle use and extended for a further 12 months post Games.</td>
<td>Public awareness campaign to reduce car use</td>
<td>No specific targets, but extensive public transport use will have reduced impact on car-use against the ‘base case’</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste targets</td>
<td>Main legacy commitment for the Games to be a catalyst for waste infrastructure in East London will not be achieved. However substantial targets are on track on waste in construction and at Games time.</td>
<td>By 2005 – 96% of all waste and waste water to be safely disposed of and treated.</td>
<td>No active material reuse or recycling.</td>
<td>90% of materials reused or recycled onsite. Packaging policy for food waste.</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials in construction</td>
<td>Several targets set regarding environmentally sensitive materials and reuse of materials in construction. These have been met.</td>
<td>No targets, but efforts were made to address materials use at all phases in construction and supply. For example, BOCOG phase out programme of ozone affecting gases, and use of composite wood materials to manufacture furniture. Criticism centred on material intensive venues such as the Stadium</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>Environmentally sensitive materials policy including PVC and timber.</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste infrastructure</td>
<td>A wastewater treatment plant which cleans and recycles non potable water has been delivered on-site.</td>
<td>Stated target of building 14 new waste water treatment plants</td>
<td>Remediation of former rubbish dumps</td>
<td>Old landfill capped and fitted with methane gas capture but infrastructure not actively deployed.</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity plan</td>
<td>Clear biodiversity action plan to replace biodiversity that was lost through construction and to enhance biodiversity outcomes for the site.</td>
<td>Creation of a number of green zones including a 680 ha Park and increased tree planting including 240 kilometres of trees and grass.</td>
<td>Proposed but not carried through</td>
<td>New Park created.</td>
<td>Network of green spaces created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat creation</td>
<td>Explicit approach to habitat creation</td>
<td>No specific information</td>
<td>Remediation of former rubbish dumps and quarries and creation of 250 ha of urban/green space.</td>
<td>Wetlands created and remediated.</td>
<td>Remediation of derelict coastal land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Specific local employment targets set and the key targets have been exceeded.</td>
<td>No specific targets</td>
<td>No consultation or community participation</td>
<td>Strong volunteering strategy.</td>
<td>The area was derelict with no immediate local community. No information on specific employment targets but project was a significant economic boost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of new business opportunities into legacy</td>
<td>Plans in place to create new business opportunities through a variety of means.</td>
<td>Aim to move Beijing away from being solely a producer city to being a consumer city with attendant economic benefits.</td>
<td>Modest long term economic impacts, although infrastructure improvements will have knock-on effects.</td>
<td>Delayed establishment of new town centre. But extensive boost to NSW economy through investment.</td>
<td>Use of the Bid to focus Barcelona’s economic offer and improve its competitiveness. Substantial increase in short-term and permanent job creation in Barcelona through investment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Healthy living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Beijing</th>
<th>Athens</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Barcelona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food</strong></td>
<td>Food vision established which specifies local and healthy food options at Games time. Legacy benefits/targets still to be determined.</td>
<td>Criticism of food and beverage approach that encouraged consumption of high-energy foods.</td>
<td>No targets proposed</td>
<td>Main sponsor, McDonalds challenged to wrap food in paper rather than polystyrene</td>
<td>No targets proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports participation</strong></td>
<td>Three iterations of physical activity and sporting participation targets over successive national governments. Progress against these is disappointing.</td>
<td>Criticism that many of the sporting venues are too expensive to maintain for use by Beijing people</td>
<td>No targets proposed</td>
<td>Stated intent to improve sports participation through Olympic effect but no monitoring of this impact.</td>
<td>No targets proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Governance for sustainability

7.1. The London 2012 Programme is supported through a bespoke programme-wide governance structure that will transform after the Games. This structure provides an effective system of governance at key levels across the Programme and within individual Programme streams. The principal governance structures and mechanisms are the Olympic Board which provides political and decision-making oversight over the entire Programme, the London 2012 Senior Responsible Officers Group, the Olympic and Paralympic Legacy Board (and contributing groups including the East London Legacy Group), and the London 2012 Sustainability Group, as well as internal structures within key organisations. Governance for the wider programmes being delivered for the Park and wider six East London Host Boroughs has been through the Olympic Park Regeneration Steering Group, the East London Legacy Group (formerly the East London Legacy Board and the East London Legacy Board Executive Group which were a part of the Government’s Olympic Programme Legacy Board Structure)8.

7.2. Through effective governance, the Games Key Stakeholders have delivered against a highly coordinated set of objectives within an immoveable timeframe. The achievement is impressive: the Olympic Park completed ahead of schedule and under budget, an array of inheritances for industry and government from both the ODA and LOCOG’s work in skills and employment, construction, healthy living, carbon and in relation to waste management. By 2014 much of this system of governance will no longer be in place and the governance and institutional landscape largely transformed. Many of the organisations established to deliver various programme elements will have been wound up including the ODA and LOCOG. Dedicated Games units in organisations like DCMS, DEFRA and the GLA will also have been disbanded or in some cases restructured. Some funding streams are planned to cease, while others are expected to be reformed for the purposes of the legacy period. The Olympic Park Legacy Company (OPLC) will have been absorbed into the new London Legacy Development Corporation, whilst we understand the Host Boroughs are considering continuing in their coordination efforts and to maintain the Host Boroughs Coordination Unit.

7.3. The detail on the future of individual initiatives is covered thematically in this report. We have focused on the legacy for East London as a key legacy strand given that much of the physical and socio-economic legacy is focused here. While it is recognised that legacy benefits are widespread across the UK and even internationally (through International Inspiration for example), our capacity to assess these benefits is limited by our resourcing. However, we will attempt to capture the impact of wider benefits in general in our final review, called ‘Making a Difference’.

7.4. While on the whole we are satisfied that there is, or will be, an adequate legacy plan for most streams of work arising from the 2012 Programme (with the partial exceptions of waste infrastructure and to some degree on healthy living), we are concerned that without

---

8 Since late 2010, responsibility for the East London Legacy Board and the East London Legacy Board Executive Group was transferred from DCLG to the GLA, which streamlined both groups to form a single East London Legacy Group that in turn reports to the Olympic Park Regeneration Steering Group (OPRS).
an ongoing single coordinating focus, these are in danger of drifting off-course, while any emerging gaps and duplication of effort will not be able to be acknowledged or acted upon. Significantly, we are concerned that the wealth of opportunities that have been generated through the Games Programme (the wider legacy) may lie underdeveloped without strategic coordination. For this reason, we believe that the entire legacy vision deserves an opportunity to be refreshed, given that no clear vision has emerged since 2004 which unifies individual organisational visions for East London and the River Lea (and we made a comment to this effect in an early Annual Review). This requires a two-handed response: an appropriate governance mechanism; and, a willingness to re-engage with the purpose of the legacy phase from a post-Games standpoint. We recognise that in identifying this as an issue, we are broadening the scope of our review from that strictly confined to the 2012 Programme to consider the ramifications of the programme for East London and the River Lea.

7.5. There is a view amongst a limited number of stakeholders that once the Games are over, the formal East London legacy should be primarily confined to the prescribed activities of the Olympic Park Legacy Company/London Legacy Development Corporation as the appropriate formal legacy owner, while broader legacy should be effectively and quickly mainstreamed. However, this view is counterbalanced by that of many wider stakeholders who see a considerable job still to be done under the aegis of the Games Programme. Much of what was offered within the Bid to East London will only come to fruition in several years hence. There is a sense, often reflected in the media, that East London is still waiting for its reward for giving up land and submitting to years of spatial disruption. While there is a need for East London to evolve beyond the formal legacy programme, it is important that the existing investment is threaded carefully into the broader future for East London and for the Lea Valley. The practical challenge of bridging the formal legacy, the wider legacy and the job of mainstreaming these into the business of London is not simple or straightforward.

7.6. The challenge in moving into the legacy period is therefore how the vision and aspiration for East London articulated in London’s bid for the Games, can be kept relevant, responsive, strategically driven, and, where necessary supported in the years beyond 2014 both through mainstream and bespoke processes where required. This is made particularly so given the holistic and ambitious nature of the Bid vision, necessitating the involvement of a wide range of government, private and third sector players as well as deep-rooted engagement with existing and emerging communities.

7.7. In this regard, the Commission welcomes the continuance of programme governance via the East London Legacy Group which will maintain a focus on programme objectives and link directly to the convergence agenda of the Host Boroughs. The Commission hopes this body will continue to have the wherewithal beyond the time when dedicated Games units in Key Stakeholder organisations have been restructured to continue its work within this aegis going forward. We urge Key Stakeholders to continue to be vigilant in ensuring this coordination is resourced, effective and strategic in its nature.
7.8. However, in the course of this review it has been very clear that there is considerable support from environmental and some key local stakeholders for the bringing together of some form of loose coordination mechanism or ‘community of practice’ that allows local leadership, strategic interests, sharing of local practice, and the capacity to draw on top-down and bottom-up visions for the area. Spatially and politically, this grouping should be broadly aligned within a complex East London governance landscape, which takes in a spatial scale reaching beyond the proposed boundaries of the LLDC, to incorporate the whole of the Lea Valley (thereby bringing together socio-economic and environmental regeneration concerns). While there are varying views on the exact nature of such a mechanism (from some who wish to see it have the powers of a development corporation to others who see value in a place for local leaders and practitioners to strategically tackle sustainability-related roadblocks), all who support the proposal recognise that this is beyond the remit of the LLDC/OPLC spatially and politically and must incorporate key private sector, public sector and third sector/community interests. The Commission’s view is that it is not appropriate for such a gathering to be a new bureaucratic structure, or for it to be a new funded body of any kind, but a far more pragmatic grouping of stakeholders that complements the existing governance and coordination structures within the area.
7.9. Practically, there is no obvious body or individual which should lead on generating this organising principle although the Olympic Park Regeneration Steering Group and its officer-level counterpart offer the most immediate functional opportunity for facilitating this discussion. While these groups are by their nature focussed on the East London legacy as defined spatially by the six Host Boroughs, there is a need to enable a wider view to be taken which does not duplicate or cut across the work of the ELLG and the six Host Boroughs, and which enables private and community sector interests to be at the table. The rationale for moving beyond the spatial scale of the six Host Boroughs is closely linked to the inherent benefits of working within the ecological boundaries of the River Lea. Yet, this proposal is not simply about the river and its surrounds, but much more about what the river offers light industry, residential developers, employers, communities as well as the flora and fauna of this part of London. It is important to note here that the Commission is not recommending that the excellent work of the boroughs and the Key Stakeholders on convergence or the socio-economic goals of the 2012 Programme be superseded in any way, nor that the governance structures that support this work be rewritten.

7.10. The All Party Parliamentary Group for East London includes Members of Parliament with constituent interests in East London and this Group may also be able to assist by offering leadership in convening a gathering of a community of practice – bringing together local business leaders, entrepreneurs, third sector leaders as well as those agency representatives that wish to engage in the process. While it is beyond our remit to formally recommend this option to the All Party Parliamentary Group for East London, we hope that this Group will offer to assist in kicking off this process.

Recommendation 1

That key East London organisations including LVRPA, OPLC, Host Boroughs, Westfield, Triathlon Homes, Natural England, British Waterways, the Environment Agency, and third sector bodies come together to formulate a community of practice and critical path for meeting wider legacy aspirations and initiatives and to ensure these remain on-task, coordinated and deliver optimum benefit.
8 Lea Valley legacy

8.1 Sustainable cities and city interventions

8.1.1 Leading edge international sustainability experts are now increasingly viewing cities as city-systems – a series of interconnected cycles of dynamic and interrelated human and natural actors.\(^9\) As part of this, scientists and experts recognise that human patterns of living are deeply reliant on natural as well as human made systems. Yet, what is also being made clear is that cities are not strategically taking advantage of the benefits on offer from both human and ecological systems. Indeed, industrialisation patterns have traditionally failed to understand the way natural cycles and industrial cycles can help each other. Yet the deep integration of human and natural cycles is seen by many experts as the only way forward for the cities of the future. By way of example, integrating urban food growing is likely to become a necessity as the globe reaches its ecological capacity and the human population continues to expand (the Chinese Government is already building agri-cities – see Wuhan\(^10\) for example). This proposition is highly complex as in most cities green space is at a premium and water and nutrients are typically less and less available. The ‘city-as-a-system’ concept helps to unpack this conundrum by redesigning physical space, incorporating technology, and learning from, and optimising what the underlying natural cycles can deliver. It is well documented that many cities around the globe are experiencing considerable environmental pressures, and resultant knock-on effects on resident populations which gives urgency to this task. However, the opportunities for strategic intervention are few and far between given the deep complexity of city design. In London, the revitalisation of the Lea Valley represents one such opportunity – brought to the fore through the combined efforts of the London 2012 Programme and other factors such as the establishment of the Lea Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA). The opportunity is not ecological, nor is it even environmental; instead it is a deeply joined-up opportunity which requires environmentalists, industrialists, entrepreneurs and social policy experts to work together to get truly optimum, sustainable results.

8.2 Strategic opportunity for the River Lea

8.2.1 The revitalisation of the Lower Lea Valley was a significant plank of the London 2012 bid. The river forms part of the Lea Valley which reaches from the M25 right down to the Thames. Regeneration of the Olympic Park has delivered significant environmental benefits in this lower part of the valley including extraordinary flood risk mitigation, enhanced biodiverse habitats, improved water quality as well as improved navigability of the river. Regulatory agencies now recognise that there is a significant and once in a lifetime opportunity to extend the revitalisation of the Lea up and down its length. The potential to integrate environmental regeneration with the socio-economic convergence agenda is now ripe for the picking with all its synergistic benefits. Bringing these two agendas together is the technical challenge.

---

9 See for example Benyus J, 1997 Biomimicry: Innovation Inspired by Nature; Head P, 2008 Entering the Ecological Age the Engineer’s role (Brunel Lecture) Ellen Macarther Foundation Towards the Circular Economy 2012

8.2.2. Regeneration of the whole Lea Valley is widely considered by environmental stakeholders as the last opportunity to revitalise any of London’s rivers to deliver a vastly improved environment, and significant social and economic amenity. While the environmental benefits are critical (clean water, clean soil, improved habitats), the economic and social benefits of river revitalisation are also starkly apparent in the Lower Lea. Improved river amenity is strongly linked to renewed redevelopment of sub-performing commercial and industrial assets in the Lower Lea and linked to other canal regenerations. British Waterways has drawn on economic appraisal modelling on the impact of improvements to amenity of waterways in support of waterway regeneration projects, while the NAO has noted the higher than anticipated receipts on the sale of the Olympic Village (by 14m) also aligns with this view.\(^\text{11,12}\) The improved social connectivity in and around the river is beginning to take shape, and will continue to mature for years to come. New communities planned as part of the Park development are only possible as a result of cleaning up the river and its banks.

8.2.3. The opportunity to benefit from improved river amenity throughout the length of the Lea requires a far-sighted and holistic understanding of what is possible. The Lea has traditionally been a place of industry and trade as well as supporting a thriving biodiverse habitat. These two streams of activity can coexist in future under a whole-of-natural-system approach, where the ecological benefits of the river valley support, and are supported by industrial, commercial and residential activity.

8.2.4. Industrial ecology (in which large-scale businesses such as food manufacturers, laundries, timber yards, waste processors and the like, share their resources along closed-loops) delivers significant reductions in the use of raw materials, produces less waste, and are highly energy and water efficient. By way of example, a timber-yard’s waste product can be effectively turned into energy in a gasification plant, which can in turn heat steam for use in a laundry or cannery, which can in turn, send on its waste water for use in an industry which requires cooling water. Industrial ecology zones are in place all over the world, notably Rotterdam Port is one of the largest Industrial Ecology complexes. Importantly, Industrial Ecology requires careful planning to enable the necessary closed loop resource sharing infrastructure to be put in place. The seeds of this approach have been sown within the Park, with the district-wide energy centre designed to accept biomass to drive its engines, and with the potential for a future link to the blackwater treatment plant. It is therefore not beyond the mind’s eye to imagine an Industrial Ecology Plan for the Lea. A carefully targeted demonstration or pilot project could be a way forward to test the applicability of Industrial Ecology in the Lea Valley.

---

12 Sustainability Review Olympic Park and Legacy 2005 PBA. http://www.britishwaterways.co.uk/olympics/lower-lea-valley-projects
8.2.5. Parts of the Lea Valley have been earmarked as a centre for green collar jobs and a green technology zone (through the Mayor’s Green Enterprise Zone and the Government’s Tech City initiative). It is clear these strategies can play an important part in supporting the legacy phase for East London. However, without a clear vision, these jobs and industries are unlikely to materialise in any significant numbers unless a strategic, multilateral approach is taken to enable the transformation to occur. Strategic land-uses require alignment, private and public sector interests need to be understood, while the resource and environmental planning required must be coordinated not just on a precinct level but on a whole-of-river-valley, and strategic landscape level. The Mayor’s range of planning frameworks including the London Plan, the Upper Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework and Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance provide a broad planning framework for this vision to be formulated. The social and environmental benefits of adopting this far-reaching vision would be extraordinary, including extensive green infrastructure for healthy living and socialising, vastly improved river amenity and opportunities for residential development, revitalised social and community connections centred on the life and activity of the river. Perhaps paradoxically, the economic downturn offers a unique opportunity to invest in a strengthening of the British economy by grasping the opportunities that a sustainable future offers. ‘Responsible capitalism’ in this regard is one facet of this rubric which can be strengthened by embracing a broader meaning of ‘growth’ from being one which is solely focussed on financial throughput. In this way, the vision for the Lea has the capacity to kick-start the new sustainable economy in a way that few cities in the world have the space or the governance to engender, drawing on both the ground-breaking convergence agenda and the substantial green technology seeds that have been sown.
8.2.6. The alternative case, where no holistic approach is taken, would be counterproductive for the existing work on the Lower Lea. Pollutants travelling from upstream will eventually re-pollute the Lower Lea and impact on the biodiversity and the general amenity of the riverine environment within the Park and beyond. In strictly economic terms, the sizable investment in the clean-up of the Lower Lea would have been poorly managed, with corrosive outcomes for future returns. On a longer term basis, the strategic opportunity to help London move to a deeply sustainable footing will have been all but lost.

8.2.7. It is encouraging to note that a number of agencies are already moving to support this type of approach which is underpinned by Natural Environment White Paper initiatives. Natural England, in conjunction with the Environment Agency and British Waterways, has developed four Green Infrastructure Principles which provide a useful framework. The Environment Agency is conducting a Lower Lea pilot under the Water Framework Directive which establishes a new catchment based approach to river basin management to deliver improvements to water quality. Thames Water is a key partner in the pilot. The pilot will secure the future of riverine ecosystems along with the Olympic Park Biodiversity Action Plan. In addition, the Environment Agency and Natural England will work together to deliver the Defra objective of ‘coherent and resilient ecological networks through actions to restore habitats, tackle diffuse pollution from rural and urban sources, pollution from metal mines and address invasive non-native species’. This will be achieved through working with civil society organisations. Also, agencies such as Leaside Regeneration have their own individual vision (Water City) and British Waterways (LLV Waterspace Strategy) for sections of the Valley which could be effectively joined-up. There is widespread support from these agencies and other key players in the Valley for this strategic vision to be garnered, and for the Valley to be able to act as a test-bed for mainstreaming a range of highly sustainable technologies and systems. What is needed is to complement and expand this work so it is able to speak to and be spoken to by the socio-economic aims of the convergence agenda, and the broader business and third sector community.

8.2.8. Many agencies own or manage land along its banks, and a number of statutory agencies have a role in its regulation. Notably the Lea Valley Regional Park Authority has statutory responsibility for large portions of the Valley to the north and south of Olympic Park, covering its environmental, tourism and leisure remit. The GLA has two planning frameworks which cover parts of the Upper and Lower Lea respectively and have been negotiated over lengthy periods with stakeholders. A number of large private landholders are also present in the Valley. Regulatory authority extends to Europe with exceedences of water borne pollutants in storm conditions already being given attention and is the subject of infraction proceedings. A whole-of-valley strategic governance mechanism would enable another significant vision for the Valley to emerge: one that is born out of the 2012 Programme, but which aptly encompasses advances in technology, systems-theory and latest developments in science to deliver a profoundly sustainable, equitable city-region in thirty years hence.
8.2.9. This vision cannot be achieved without a strategic alignment of interests, and recognition that collaboration, innovation and prudent investment are all required. It requires a consensus brought about through rigorous strategic planning and carefully crafted partnerships of interest. Above all, it must be adaptable to incorporate new technologies and processes that are ripe for mainstreaming. This approach requires a future-proofing strategy to ensure that opportunities are not inadvertently vetoed, and that the right enablers are put in place at the right time.

8.2.10. The community of interest we have proposed to guide this work is deliberately organic. It requires local leadership to drive the development of such a vision and this cannot be imposed, but it can be given some support to form. We would expect that future potential requirements for resourcing and policy alignment for example could be addressed once the vision has taken shape and there is greater clarity about what is needed to implement it.

**Recommendation 2**

That a key priority for the community of interest group (Recommendation 1) is to commission the development of a future-proofing strategy for the entire Lea Valley, that actively identifies and removes road-blocks to the whole river-valley becoming a single sustainable urban, green infrastructure system with enhanced economic, social and environmental outcomes and amenity. The development of the strategy should be undertaken by an appropriate agency or partnership on behalf of the coordination group and should take account of the convergence agenda.
9.1. Governance and resourcing

9.1.1. The CEO of the OPLC has demonstrated a considerable willingness to consider what is best for the long-term sustainability of the Park and within the broader LLDC boundaries.

9.1.2. We have been highly critical in the past of the OPLC’s lack of direction in relation to governance for sustainability. We previously recommended as far back as 2008, that:

‘The LDA [now OPLC] should assess the resources required to embed sustainability into the Legacy Master plan Framework and to act as an effective client. These resources should be deployed as permanent staff at a senior level where possible.’

9.1.3. However we have seen a significant amount of activity since August 2011 which demonstrates the organisation is rapidly mobilising resources and expertise to enable it to better handle the sustainability agenda. This mobilisation comes late but there is strong evidence that socio-economic and environmental sustainability principles over this time have been and continue to be embedded into the work of the organisation at a systemic level and will have impact on the important activities of the organisation leading up to the transformation period.

9.1.4. The OPLC structure is, at this stage of its life, focused on executive positions. There are five Executive Directors reporting to the Chief Executive, with many more Directors reporting into these Executive Directors across a number of individual functions. Environmental sustainability falls under the Chief of Design and the Director for Planning and Sustainability. The OPLC has governance structures in place to manage its approach to the socio-economic side of sustainability, which falls under the Executive Director for Regeneration and Community Partnerships. Corporate overview of these workstreams is provided by the Communities Committee, the Design Review Panel, the Legacy Youth Panel and the Built Environment Access Panel.

9.1.5. A new governance structure has been put in place to ensure that environmental sustainability is considered in a cross-cutting manner across the organisation. This includes an Executive Management Board Sustainability Working Group that is chaired by the Chief of Design, supported by a Sustainability Project Team, chaired by the Director of Planning and Sustainability. The Commission understands that a new position is to be created at ‘Head of’ level which will focus on sustainability and innovation, and that will work closely with the Planning and Sustainability Project Manager, the Planning and Sustainability Director and the Chief of Design. In addition, a ‘virtual’ team is embedded across the divisions and with dotted reporting lines back to the Planning and Sustainability Director. With respect to obtaining effective peer review, the organisation has made a commitment to establish an external Design Quality Panel to peer review the organisation’s spatial approach, and this Panel will include the Chair of the Built Environment Access Panel (which the organisation has chosen to retain) as well as dedicated sustainability expertise.

9.1.6. From our perspective, the organisation has made substantial strides towards a comprehensive approach to governance for sustainability. This could be further
strengthened by ensuring that the new LLDC Board includes a position with dedicated sustainability responsibilities, and by considering how its work can be externally assured (explored below) as well as broadening its external advice beyond design/spatially related matters.

9.1.7. To its credit, the organisation has been obtaining external sustainability advice on an ad-hoc basis with small groups of informed stakeholders throughout 2011 and this has been a productive process, resulting in the organisation considering a number of innovations in sustainability. A considerable amount of work has occurred in the area of innovation and there is now a substantial workstream devoted to ways in which innovation can enhance performance right across the organisation’s objectives. The Design Quality Panel, provided that it includes sufficient sustainability expertise, will act as a consistent point of external advice on spatially focussed issues such as planning and design. However, the organisation will also need to consider how it receives external advice on other sustainability issues into the future. On this matter, the OPLC has indicated that it will continue to work closely with stakeholders including the GLA, Host Boroughs, the Institute for Sustainability and other influential bodies.

9.1.8. The way in which the OPLC wishes to seek sustainability assurance of its work beyond March 2013 is one for the organisation to give thought to over the coming months. We have suggested that, if another assurance body is considered for establishment in London post March 2013, it would make sense for this to have a remit over major projects. The activities of the OPLC could be assured by a body of this kind, on the assumption that, organisations receiving assurance should also pay for it. One way or another however, the OPLC should be proactive in determining how it wishes to be assured, which is sharply distinct from the role of the London Assembly in its political oversight role. The OPLC has advised that it welcomes external sustainability assurance and will be giving thought to securing long-term assurance aside from the scrutiny that is provided by the London Assembly.

9.1.9. The organisation formulated a sustainability strategy to drive its own activities and the outcomes it is seeking on the Park. A draft strategy was developed in 2011 which was broadly criticised for being too generic and not sufficiently ambitious. The Company took this criticism on board and decided to embark on a fresh approach. A revised environmental sustainability strategy focussed on the Park has now been produced and will shortly be published. The strategy is communications-focussed, giving character and alluding to a vision for 2030, and incorporates a set of key targets as well as a framework within which to consider them. The organisation has strengthened many of its aspirations and targets in recent months which is welcomed. In response to suggested improvements to the strategy in relation to waste infrastructure, smart grid technology and urban informatics, the organisation has advised that it is working with leaders in innovation in these areas. It is pleasing to see that sustainable behaviour change is one of the key areas of focus and we are aware that the organisation recognises the critical role behaviour change will play in embedding sustainability into people’s lives. We are pleased to see that the OPLC is committed to actively monitoring and benchmarking sustainability
performance in the early years so that longer term aspirations can be effectively set and that it will report publicly on its progress. We commend the OPLC on producing the strategy, and urge the organisation to continue to drive for increasingly stringent aspirational goals over the longer term.

9.1.10. We are aware that the business plan is in draft form and we have not been given access to it to assure, although we have been advised it will be shortly available to us. Just prior to publishing this report, the organisation finalised four key policies on socio-economic, equalities and inclusion, inclusive design, and community engagement (drafts of which we have previously seen and commented upon). We have previously been critical of the lack of defined targets, particularly in skills and employment, which are a key sustainability element for the regeneration of East London and the organisation’s role in this aim. The equalities and inclusion policy recognises that the organisation will be monitored against a number of employment and inclusion goals, but it does not set overarching targets for these. It has however, published defined employment targets against equalities groups and for local employment for the Estates Facilities Management Contract. These targets are very welcome and demonstrate a substantial commitment to employing local residents, women, people from a Black and Minority Ethnic background and disabled people. There is also a substantial commitment to engaging volunteers and to creating 50 apprenticeships under the contract. Whilst we recognise that setting overarching targets is challenging as the range of contracts are diverse, we would expect the OPLC to continue to set its own lead by publishing targets on a contract-by-contract basis once these have been negotiated through a competitive dialogue process.

9.1.11. The Commission has previously sought published targets in advance of negotiation of contracts with suppliers and contractors. However, the OPLC has now applied the process of competitive dialogue to drive for exceptional commitments from tenderers. In two successfully negotiated tenders, the OPLC has managed to secure commitments in equalities and inclusion which go well beyond industry best practice. (See inset). Our view is that while this approach is necessarily uncertain in outcome, the evidence so far suggests that it is delivering outcomes above expectations. The organisation is also using this approach to drive performance in other areas beyond minimum compliance (for example against the Code for Sustainable Homes). We are yet to see the specific outcomes from this broader approach but would hope that the organisation is being as rigorous as it has been on employment targets in reaching for leading-practice results. Should this change over time, the organisation would be well advised to reconsider its decision to apply competitive dialogue as the key means to determine key targets on a contract by contract basis.
### Table 4 Agreed contract diversity and inclusion targets for Olympic Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Indicator</th>
<th>Estates and Facilities Management</th>
<th>Sports and Event Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of the workforce that have permanent residency in the Host Boroughs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the workforce that are from BAME groups</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the workforce that are women</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the workforce that are disabled</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of apprenticeship places</td>
<td>50 (total)</td>
<td>36 (pa)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 9.2. Key sustainability challenges and issues

### 9.2.1. The OPLC is challenged by difficult economic times just when it is in the process of negotiating major contracts for the first of its development platforms and for the range of activities and functions that will occur on the Park. The Legacy Communities Scheme for new development has been resubmitted and includes a clear commitment to deliver zero carbon homes in advance of regulatory requirements, levels of water performance in advance of current industry average and a commitment to ensure that all homes on the Park exceed the minimum requirements of Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 on the basis that it can commit to achieving these targets in the near-term.

### 9.2.2. We have maintained that the OPLC needs to set itself a sustainability roadmap to improve outcomes over time. The environmental sustainability strategy is a significant step forward but could give a clearer sense of expectations against 5 year tranches. In particular, the strategy at the moment commits to a 100% zero carbon approach to homes with up to 35% of this being met through allowable solutions outside of the Park. While we applaud the organisation for recognising its power to influence outside Park boundaries, we have advised the organisation that we would expect to see a vision for how it will eventually reach the 100% zero carbon homes commitment within the Park boundaries in addition to the allowable solutions. This level of performance would be well beyond compliance but could be achieved over an agreed timeframe. In this, we understand from OPLC that the organisation sees its commitment to allowable solutions as one way to contribute to the convergence agenda and this approach will not compromise its long-term commitments to improving environmental sustainability performance on the Park. We understand the organisation is creating a delivery plan which will demonstrate how it will work towards reducing its onsite carbon emissions further including the future of the groundbreaking black water treatment plant, extending the District Heat Network (DHN) and increasing the renewable energy content to the DHN.

### 9.2.3. Without this long-term road-map, guidance available to the tenderer, the community and to the organisation itself about where medium to long-term expectations are placed is not as clear as it could be. The organisation has been justifiably criticised for this lack of a
long-term plan and commensurate targets. It now has the internal resources and the premier position it retains as one of a handful of world-class regeneration agencies with prime sites in which businesses want to invest to drive world leading practice. Few places in the world are able to attract investment in the way the Park has and will attract interest. The recent sale of the Athletes Village at a fee above expectations demonstrates the inherent value of the site to property investors and developers and the organisation is now well-placed to optimise this through competitive dialogue.

9.2.4. The transformation of the Park from its Games-time role into a place in which people can enjoy will come under intense scrutiny as soon as the Games are over. East London stakeholders are already concerned about the length of time they will need to wait to get access to their local Park and other commercial stakeholders are also exerting pressure for the Park to be open sooner, or for there to be a partial opening. The organisation has indicated that the transformation phase will take up to 18 months from September 2012 with the first staged opening from the summer in 2013. While we recognise that the development schedule for transformation must be robust, we urge the OPLC to do what it can to make elements of the Park accessible to the public as soon as possible after Games-time. In this regard, we are aware that the organisation is embarking on an extensive communications and stakeholder engagement campaign to draw local communities into engagement with the Park as it begins to reopen and this strategy appears to be robust.

9.2.5. The planning targets that accompany the transformation of the Park have been novated from the ODA to the OPLC. The ODA achieved excellence by going beyond minimum target performance requirements. We initially held concerns that the OPLC may use the ODA’s high achievement to relax its own approach to transformation. However we are pleased to report that it has set meaningful and robust sustainability targets including separate targets for reuse and recycling which have been included in the tender, contract and documents for transformation works. In this light we would expect the OPLC to achieve overall performance which remains above minimum requirements.

9.2.6. The transformation (infrastructure) team within the OPLC is reasonably well-resourced to meet the challenges of transformation, developing processes, building on the experience of the ODA to assist them in managing this phase including internal monitoring and reporting processes. We have previously recommended that both LOCOG and the OPLC learn from the ODA’s success in health and safety and adopt similar exemplary approaches to worker wellbeing (see recommendation 3 from the review of Inclusion and Healthy Living). However, unlike the ODA there is at present no dedicated internal audit team that will be able to ensure site contractors are meeting their obligations on-site. Two internal project sponsors the Health Safety and Environment Project Sponsor, and the Infrastructure Project Sponsor share the responsibility for review of the Project Management Partner. We are concerned that this resourcing level may not be sufficient for the task at hand. However we have been advised that given the different nature of the relationship between the OPLC and its contractors (in that there is no Delivery Partner, but rather a Principal Contractor) the Principal Contractor will work closely with the Project Management Partner to develop a joint approach to overall safety in the first instance. The Principal Contractor will provide
the first-line assurance function on-site. In addition, the Principal Contractor will increase its assurance resourcing prior to taking over the site. The Project Management Partner, which will deliver overall project management reports to OPLC including audit results, will be reviewed by OPLC as part of this contractual relationship. While we recognise that the arrangements on the Park differ from those in place for the ODA we urge the OPLC to closely monitor the effectiveness of the audit and assurance arrangements for the site and to consider establishing an internal audit presence on-site if this becomes necessary in future.

9.2.7. The Transformation Director is ex-ODA and brings considerable understanding of the task at hand. He has acknowledged that sustainable transport of materials will be one of the biggest challenges for transformation, particularly without a rail-head nearby at least in the short-term. We have been advised that discussions are ongoing with the rail head operator to provide a rail option during transformation. During the course of the review, statutory stakeholders were keen to impress upon us the latent value of the river as a transport option which could be optimised in the legacy period. We urge the OPLC to maximise the uptake of river transport options, not only in transporting construction materials but in an ongoing waste and logistics capacity. The OPLC has advised it will consider water logistics options where appropriate.

9.2.8. The OPLC is coming under criticism for not having articulated employment and skills targets, including for local communities. We are aware that the organisation has significant skills and expertise in this area which has been recently bolstered by the appointment of a well-respected local leader to the position of Executive Director of Regeneration and Community Partnerships. The organisation is also undertaking a number of robust modelling and research projects to better understand where jobs are needed, what skills are required and how specific sectors can be better supported. The OPLC has committed to match or better the ODA’s performance in skills and employment and that it wants to improve upon LOCOG’s job brokerage system and are working with the boroughs to do this. The organisation must continue to follow its own lead by publishing minimum employment and skills targets for newly approved contracts on activity that occurs on the Park. As part of this it will be important to know how the OPLC will use its ‘best endeavours’ to negotiate targets within contracts that are further down the supply chain.

9.2.9. There is evidence that the Director of Venues is committed to learning from LOCOG’s experience and is embedding sustainability into the venues strategy. We understand the organisation intends to seek BS8901 certification (although we would expect to see this commitment embedded into the business plan). The organisation has engaged specialist sustainability events consultants to develop a sustainable events strategy for the OPLC, to review its own approach to sustainability corporately and to consider opportunities for further sustainability gains within Park venues. A key outcome from the work is the expectation that small to medium sized businesses are to comply with sustainability events principles without themselves having to be BS8901 compliant. We support this pragmatic approach on the proviso that the underlying sustainability outcomes are met when suppliers are engaged to work on the Park or with OPLC.
9.2.10. As part of its approach to sustainable events we understand that the OPLC is developing a food and beverage policy and a food charter and is reviewing the transformation policy for additional sustainability opportunities. While we have not yet seen the output of this work, we are impressed with the Director of Venues’ commitment to embedding sustainability through events management and through the long-term operation of the venues. We would however, urge the OPLC to draw on the intellectual capital, processes and networks that have already been established by LOCOG wherever possible. In particular, we look to the OPLC to ensure the 2012 Food Vision be adopted, and/or improved upon in developing a food policy for the Park. In this regard we draw the OPLC’s attention to the two recommendations we made in our Food Review about optimising the potential for food growing on the Park and sustainable food retailing and packaging:

‘The OPLC should develop detailed design guidance for developers on how to incorporate food growing into their development plots, along the lines of the guidance developed for the South East False Creek in Vancouver, site of the 2010 Winter Games Athlete’s Village. This could be applied more widely to other developments in London by the GLA.’

‘Future development in the Olympic Park, led by the OPLC, should follow the example of the Athletes Village for which there is a draft Food Strategy that can be implemented over time as the homes are occupied and if the community demonstrates an interest in growing their own food. This would ensure that the development is future proofed and can enable food growing to be ‘retrofitted’. This should also include facilities to make it easy for residents and businesses to access healthy and sustainable food.’

9.2.11. There have been concerns raised by some stakeholders about the connectivity of the Park to venues in the north and ways in which visitors can be encouraged to visit these venues. We are aware that OPLC has this challenge in its sights and we very much support an approach which can offer a unified ticketing system across all venues, and as much cohesion as possible from the perspective of the visitor. Again, we note the work of the Director of Venues to explore the most sustainable form of ticketing available.

9.2.12. We understand the OPLC is about to embark on an innovative approach for involving communities, stakeholders and businesses in developing an interim uses strategy for those areas within the Park which are subject to long-term development. In some cases, land subject to interim uses could remain in its interim state for more than ten years, making the interim uses strategy an extremely important land-use strategy for the medium term. While we have not seen any further detail about the approach to developing this strategy, we commend the OPLC for its innovative concept. However, we believe the organisation needs to fairly quickly define the parameters for the strategy’s development and to clearly outline the process for its development. Environmental regulators want to ensure that no interim use occurs which degrades the natural environment, while many stakeholders are of the view that the interim uses strategy presents a significant opportunity to achieve enhancements to the environment in the medium term. The strategy could present an
abundance of opportunities for local communities, start-up businesses and charities to operate for the wellbeing of their constituents/customers and of the Park.

9.2.13. Design is crucial to the way the Park performs to achieve connectivity and conversion and to integrate environmental enhancements. The new Chief of Design has demonstrated this awareness and keenness to work in an integrated manner and has taken on the challenge of managing the innovation agenda for the organisation which is gaining a considerable head of steam. The Planning Application is not something this Commission is able to comment directly upon, however, we understand that numerous stakeholders have commented prior to its submission, including CABE, the Design Council, Host Boroughs and the Planning Decisions Team and now have the opportunity to comment on its final form through the statutory planning consultation period. The OPLC’s leadership role in generating a design vision for such a new town, should continue to be highlighted, critiqued, and where appropriate, celebrated through a more formalised peer review process. We now understand that the OPLC has formally engaged the BEAP (Built Environment Access Panel) to peer review future planning and design related matters from an accessibility perspective and that it intends to establish a Design Quality Panel including a sustainability expert to formally peer review its design approach in toto (both for the five development platforms and for the Park Plan (discussed below). In this respect, the Commission recommended in its 2009 Design Review:

“That sustainability specialists are involved in the evaluation of design-related tenders to ensure that the relevant issues are considered at an early stage”

9.2.14. The Park Plan is viewed by the OPLC not so much as a formal design but rather a strategic plan for how the Park will operate once it is open. It provides visions of the streetscapes of each of the zones in the Park and tries to respond to the inevitable challenges posed by the spaces within the Park as they transition from large-scale venue to local and regional venue. We were able to view a presentation of the Park Plan and while initial impressions are positive, we recognise that a thorough review by design professionals is what is needed for the Plan to receive the imprimatur required. One key issue for the Plan is how the habitat created within the waterways and on land can be allowed to thrive while still meeting other sometimes competing demands of Park activation, safety, thoroughfares and spaces for events. We would like to see more detail of the impact of the Park Plan in terms of activations and visitors in each zone before we can draw any conclusions at this stage. Specific comments on the Park’s biodiversity are covered under the biodiversity section of this report.

9.2.15. Site-wide infrastructure opportunities (such as energy, water, waste and transport) are being coordinated within the Real Estate team and we understand that the potential to extend existing infrastructure networks is being explored at present. While, at one level it makes sense that the Real Estate team are taking the lead on this work given the close relationship between development and infrastructure requirements, there is a concern that new opportunities for sustainable infrastructure may be being given lower priority than standard practice. Yet, there are significant additional site-wide opportunities that could
be explored including to enhance the use of the river for transportation of goods, materials and waste, site-wide waste reticulation and collection infrastructure, linking of waste-water to the existing on-site energy infrastructure, exploring new electricity generation opportunities within the Park, enhancing rainwater capture onsite, and linking local food-growing into these water/waster/nutrient infrastructural cycles.

9.2.16. This work requires a comprehensive vision for what is possible, followed by robust technical modelling to determine whether opportunities match expectations on cost and on return. We understand that some technical work has been done on carbon modelling, and there is a range of ideas being explored through the innovation stream of work. A similar approach is now needed to explore remaining opportunities and a coordinating mantle to bring them together. It is an urgent task for the OPLC as once development platforms are commenced, retrofitting this kind of infrastructure can be hugely costly. Site-wide infrastructure is one of the biggest areas where deep sustainability gains can be made to reduce energy, carbon and water consumption. The appointment of an officer with sufficient seniority and expertise to be at the helm of this workstream should greatly assist in synthesising this work.

Recommendation 3

That OPLC/LLDC builds on its good work by demonstrating publicly how it is embedding, resourcing and reporting on environmental and socio-economic sustainability throughout its core business by the end of April 2012.
10 ODA – sustainability and governance

10.1. The ODA is due to wind up officially one year on from the Games. In effect, its post-Games transformation role for the Park has been novated to the OPLC which means that the organisation will reduce in size sooner than projected. The ODA’s active responsibilities into legacy include the handover of the Olympic Village to new consortium Triathlon Homes, Qatari Diar and Delancey. The ODA will oversee the retrofit of the Village to turn it from hostel style accommodation into complete residential apartments. The timing of ODA’s handover of socially rented and affordable housing within the Olympic Village to Triathlon Homes needs to be considered carefully so that these homes can be tenanted in an orderly manner and in a way which sets a positive tone for the new community there.

10.2. To support the handover of its responsibilities to the OPLC, the ODA has written key specifications for the transition, and has included ‘take-back’ clauses into contracts to ensure that contractors are responsible for trying to reuse or salvage materials from temporary facilities or overlays to avoid a complete about-face in contractor performance. However, it is now the OPLC’s responsibility to set targets within this transformation period (as discussed in section 8).

10.3. The ODA has met or exceeded nearly every sustainability target that was set for it as part of its planning consent. The big exception is the target to have a 20% contribution to on-site energy from renewable sources, which was unable to be met following the failure of a tender process to deliver a large-scale wind-turbine on the Park due to legal issues relating to the design specification. The ODA’s alternative strategy, to fund two community retrofit programmes, is well underway and operational management of RENEW and REFIT has been handed over to the GLA Energy Team to manage. Any issues which could arise in the management of this programme into legacy are able to be managed through the contractual conditions between the manager (now the GLA) and contractors. While these programmes do not provide a direct renewable energy benefit, they abate both carbon and energy through energy efficiency measures. These programmes have the potential to be a model for future initiatives including meeting the national zero carbon targets after 2016. The GLA will assume full responsibility for these post 2012 and will input into the required annual report to the Planning Decisions Team.

10.4. The ODA has contributed an extraordinary legacy to the construction industry in the UK and worldwide. Through its robust sustainability approach and high targets, it drove innovation, made financial savings, and improved the health and safety outcomes for its workers. There is much to be proud of, and the ODA has rightly invested in capturing these learnings through case-studies and through the establishment of a stand-alone website, dedicated to this learning legacy. The legacy of this website is currently under negotiation with a suitable construction industry body.
10.5. The ODA’s legacy responsibility for any unanticipated actions brought against it for works it has carried out may need to be clarified publicly. As a government agency, it is assumed that this responsibility would revert to the appropriate Minister, but it will be important for there to be a clear line for any complaints or actions post-Games (in the same way as there will be for LOCOG).

10.6. The benefits of the ODA’s approach to embedding sustainability early, and robustly are showing in relation to its on-time, under-budget achievement. However, more could be done to understand how these learnings could be translated into the government estate. The capacity to cut red tape and save money through an early investment in sustainability governance is at present only a partially explored opportunity for Government.
11.1. LOCOG, as a private company tasked with delivering the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, has a strictly time-limited tenure. It will wind up within months of the Games concluding, and its staffing levels will drop dramatically as soon as the Games are over. LOCOG’s sustainability team will have a skeleton staff who will work on the final post-Games sustainability report and oversee the sustainability requirements for venue bump-out and post-Games transition of venues back into their original state. It will be important for LOCOG to ensure that this reduced staffing level is adequate for the resourcing required during this period.

11.2. LOCOG will establish a legal entity to handle any post-Games legal disputes that might arise, including any to do with post-Games transition of venues to their business-as-usual mode. This will be important for any legacy issues that arise in the long-term remediation of sites which have been used as temporary venues, such as Greenwich Park.

11.3. LOCOG’s legacy, like the ODA, is significant, but unlike the ODA, its plans for mainstreaming initiatives, publicising and educating the events industry are highly constrained by its obligations on the one hand for the production of a formal knowledge management stream for the IOC and on the other, the rapid demobilisation of the organisation in the post-Games period.

11.4. LOCOG’s formal knowledge transfer programme is a requirement under its obligations to the IOC and as such is strictly managed within this legal framework. LOCOG is on target to produce a more detailed and extensive contribution to the IOC’s knowledge transfer programme than for any previous Games. It is commendable that due to LOCOG’s efforts the London Games will become the new benchmark for so many Games elements, including its sustainability outcomes.

11.5. LOCOG’s extensive contribution to the development of new industry benchmarks through the production of standards, guidelines and frameworks (See Table 5), are expected to all be available to the public in some form. The British Olympic Association has the right to use the London 2012 brand with the IOC’s permission once the Games are over and, with LOCOG and The National Archive, is developing a robust legacy access plan for publicly available documents. However, other than those already in the public domain, any heretofore unpublished information which is tagged for release will not be available publicly for a period of 15 years.

11.6. On the other hand, LOCOG’s capacity to drive for more active and industry targeted, publicly available learning legacy case studies (similar to those produced by the ODA) is limited by its capacity to resource such an initiative given its rapid demobilisation. However, the organisation has acknowledged that there is substantial industry-based learning which could be made publicly available and it is currently considering how it can translate key lessons and case studies into the public domain immediately post Games. We urge LOCOG to complement its excellent record in generating new industry benchmarks by capturing the learnings for industry in the form of targeted case studies. LOCOG, in this, has argued it is not best resourced to draw these learnings together and sees a role for national Government in this strategy. Our view is that it is not the Commission’s role to determine
which agency should resource such a process, but simply to highlight the obvious benefit to industry that would arise from making appropriate information more widely available immediately after the Games.

11.7. In addition, there is a very significant human legacy in terms of the numbers of people who will have volunteered during the Games. The use of social networking sites and pertinent information about volunteers by third parties is something which LOCOG is very carefully considering so as to ensure it complies with data protection rules while also offering individuals and appropriate charitable organisations the opportunity to work together in the future. We support this cautious approach.

11.8. GetSet and International Inspiration programmes have been groundbreaking initiatives to reach out to young people in the UK and all around the globe using the Olympic and Paralympic values as an ethical framework for engagement. The outcomes of this group of programmes is only now becoming apparent but it appears to have been highly successful in engaging young people as well as transforming legislation and policy relating to young people and sport in a number of countries. The BOA is the inheritor of the GetSet programme and discussions are underway to ensure in legacy it continues to be an effective youth engagement programme. The Commission believes this programme and International Inspiration set a new bar for international outreach and engagement with young people for the IOC.

11.9. There is evidence of recent ad-hoc engagement between the OPLC and LOCOG and this should be encouraged. One way for learnings to be shared with the OPLC is through the possibility of embedding OPLC staff in with LOCOG for Games-time. This is currently being discussed between the organisations. While this is a great idea, it does not serve organisations which are not (and cannot) be embedded in this way. Hence, there is the need for a more formal lessons-learnt programme (as discussed above).

11.10. LOCOG has an asset disposal strategy which looks to recoup revenue from the disposal of assets. Some assets have been earmarked for donation. However, those assets which are earmarked to be sold will be sold through a variety of means post-Games. LOCOG has determined that it will not be offering the OPLC or any other venue owners, assets at no cost. The Commission understands that negotiations are underway between the OPLC and LOCOG to determine what legacy the OPLC will purchase and what, of LOCOG overlay in the Park will be removed and sold to other customers. One obvious asset which would benefit the OPLC is LOCOG’s bin solution. The Commission is keen to ensure that sustainability outcomes are considered within the context of asset transfer and that where possible, appropriate sponsorship opportunities are explored by potential purchasers to offset these costs.

11.11. Venue legacy is particularly difficult to address in-toto as LOCOG has no single point where the range of legacies for all of its venues is being recorded or held (they are with the individual venue-use agreements). This includes everything from environmental management issues for Greenwich Park, through to temporary alterations to non-competition venues. Some of these legacy issues are of course understood and LOCOG is actively engaged at
a senior level in their management. However, in other cases, this knowledge remains with venue managers. In some venues there are obvious positive legacies, in other venues the legacy is neutral, or potentially in need of management to ensure venues return to the state in which they were found. It remains a potentially significant gap in LOCOG’s own central knowledge about the extent to which temporary overlay is leaving a positive or negative legacy in competition and non-competition venues. While we recognise that the resources to collate this information are not readily available just when LOCOG is in pre-Games mode, we would welcome this collation and synthesis as soon as it can be undertaken.

11.12. LOCOG has had a significant behaviour change role through its sustainability communications work and through sponsor activation. We are particularly impressed by the extent to which LOCOG has put effort into the development of a range of standards and guidelines which have and will continue to influence wider industry sectors through the application of BS8901 and innovative work with WRAP, as well as instigation of the forthcoming ISO 20121 for example. This spans individual, organisational and sector-wide behaviour change. The work undertaken by LOCOG to influence behaviour at Games-time through activation in the Park may have legacy implications and we encourage the OPLC and LOCOG to see how this work can be optimised for legacy. The broader implications of the London 2012 Programme’s delivery of new standards and policies will be covered in the Commission’s final review: ‘Making a Difference’.

Recommendation 4

That LOCOG, with appropriate support from Government, create its own learning legacy that can be shared publicly beyond the IOC family to the events industry more broadly so as to optimise the public and private sector investment in the 2012 Games and its impact on major events in the UK and worldwide.
12 GOE – sustainability and governance

12.1. For the purposes of this report, we are directing our findings to the Government Olympic Executive as the single point of contact for Government legacy initiatives. The Government has a number of legacy programmes and initiatives it is funding across a range of departments and Arms Length Bodies. The Government’s responsibilities have been mapped in the National Audit Office report on the London 2012 Programme. This is reproduced here. The Commission, in the course of this review was shown work in progress to map these programmes to legacy owners after the Games. This is an important piece of work which will enable stakeholders to have clarity about accountabilities and programme structure post 2012. In this light, we would like to see GOE produce a robust framework for legacy ownership of these programmes which shows legacy owners, funding levels and any other critical factors for implementation highlighted in a stand-alone document.

12.2. The lasting legacy of the investment in the 2012 Programme is ineluctably embodied in the physical investment in the regeneration of East London and in the enhancements to venues across London and elsewhere. The impact of the expenditure of some £9 billion of public investment over the course of the programme is significant, not only because of the tangible outcomes, but also because of the stimulus this has generated for local jobs and skills, and for the materials and construction industry. The question of whether these funds could have been better spent on alternative projects is not within the scope of this review, or this Commission, however we are aware that there is a wider Games impact study underway which will attempt to consider the so called ‘counterfactual’ in analysing these wider benefits.

Soil washing – a case of sustainable procurement

The ODA’s decision to treat soil using remediation technology, to maximise onsite treatment of contaminated soil has delivered extensive economic, social, and environmental benefits. For example, 80% of contaminated soil avoided landfill, which reduced what would have been a huge number of associated lorry journeys, and their related carbon emissions. This had social benefits for local residents and businesses from the reduced dust, noise, congestion and air pollution that is associated with removal of huge volumes of contaminated soil and the import of ‘clean’ material. Keeping the material on site, avoiding soil disposal charges and the added costs for importing clean material, saved around £68m. Future savings are likely to be substantially more since applications for landfill tax exemptions are no longer accepted and by 31st March 2012 all ongoing landfill tax exemptions will also cease.

Source: DEFRA, March 2012

12.3. There is now a significant opportunity to embed the Government’s own legacy into its other programmes going forward. On this, it is clear that the funding provided to the physical 2012 programme was successful, and resulted in highly sustainable outcomes, within time and within budget. There is already high level work afoot to understand better the impact of embedding sustainability into procurement, drawing on several high profile case studies. Preliminary outcomes suggest that embedding sustainability into its procurement...
process saved the ODA considerable amounts of money as well as delivering more robust technical outcomes, for example through choosing to wash soil on-site rather than have contaminated soil removed and replaced with virgin material (see inset). This legacy is priceless as it can only come from learnt experience over such a large project, yet it can influence countless projects to come. We strongly urge DEFRA with the support of the ODA to extend this research from capturing case studies, to a more robust analysis of the ODA expenditure against outcomes so that deeper and more systemic lessons can be uncovered and understood. Even on the basis of the information gleaned to date, we urge the Government to embed the principles of sustainable procurement into the heart of its delivery agenda to ensure outcomes are sustainable, affordable and appropriate. One way to do this would be to embed consideration of sustainable procurement into government guidance on buying standards.

12.4. We have two areas of concern that relate to the governance and funding of government programmes. These both fall under the healthy living agenda: young people’s participation in sport and the impact of the restructuring of the NHS on the capacity for healthy living agenda to be strategically driven, monitored and properly aligned over time. We have addressed these in more detail under the healthy living section in this report.

Recommendation 5
That the GOE publicly detail how its 2012 programmes, initiatives and funding will be managed into legacy, prior to the commencement of the Games period.

Recommendation 6
That the Government make fully transparent how it is meeting its commitment to improve sports participation across its range of funded programmes (and how resources and programme structures have been realigned to achieve this).

Recommendation: 7
That Government, through appropriate interdepartmental mechanisms, agree a way to ensure sustainable procurement principles and mechanisms are considered as part of government buying guidance and other relevant frameworks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Delivery body</th>
<th>Funding 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Games</td>
<td>Annual sport competition open to every school in England with a first national final in the Olympic Stadium</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Youth Sport Trust</td>
<td>£131 million from Lottery and Government Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places People Play</td>
<td>Programme to enhance local sports facilities and support mass participation in sport in England</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>£135 million of lottery awards through Sport England between 2010-11 and 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Sport</td>
<td>Funding to support Olympic and Paralympic athletes</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>Work on Elite Sport is business as usual for UK Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports participation</td>
<td>Increasing the number of people who do sport three times a week by 1 million by 2013</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Work on sustaining and growing sports participation is business as usual for Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Inspiration</td>
<td>Programme to inspire young people around the world to choose sport</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Department for Culture, Media and Sport</td>
<td>£26 million from Government funds for lifetime budget 2007-2014 with a further £19 million from private sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure a legacy from investment in the Olympic Park</td>
<td>Programme to make the Olympic Park a focal point for London's growth and a catalyst for regeneration</td>
<td>East London</td>
<td>Olympic Park Legacy Company</td>
<td>£292 million from the Department for Communities and Local Government and £40 million from the Greater London Authority. There is separate funding in the Public Sector Funding Package for the transformation of the Park after the Games (paragraph 2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East London socio-economic legacy</td>
<td>Regeneration of the East London host boroughs to enable socio-economic convergence with the rest of London</td>
<td>East London</td>
<td>Host Boroughs</td>
<td>Funding is predominantly from the host boroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Support for benefits to tourism as a result of the Games</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Visit Britain</td>
<td>The Department for Culture, Media and Sport, Visit England and Visit Britain will provide nearly £55 million towards marketing campaigns valued at £110 million, to 2014. Private sector financial commitments are required for remaining £55 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Skills</td>
<td>Project to maximise Games-related employment and skills development</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Olympic Delivery Authority/ LOCOG</td>
<td>This programme will coordinate £38 million of training investment, with public sector agencies and private sector funding jointly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Delivery body</th>
<th>Funding¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Support for a lasting business and economic legacy from the Games</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Department for Business, Innovation and Skills</td>
<td>At least £10.5 million funding from the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and investment</td>
<td>Programme using the Games to stimulate international trade and investment into the UK</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>UK Trade &amp; Investment</td>
<td>UK Trade &amp; Investment has realigned its business as usual activity in an effort to capitalise on opportunities provided by the Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable procurement</td>
<td>Programme to use the example of the Olympic Delivery Authority to promote sustainable procurement in other major projects</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>From the Olympic Delivery Authority’s budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity ‘inspired by’ London 2012</td>
<td>Project to inspire disadvantaged young people</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>The Prince’s Trust</td>
<td>Delivered through funding for other programmes and projects using the Inspire mark taking on other funding, e.g. Lottery, Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Olympiad</td>
<td>Series of events to showcase the UK’s arts and culture to the rest of the world</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td>Committed funding of £97 million. and London 2012 Festival are Arts Council England, Legacy Trust UK and the Olympic Lottery Distributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Set</td>
<td>Creation of a network of educational institutions demonstrating the Olympic and Paralympic values</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td>Some funding from the Department for Education’s core budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>Providing volunteers to support the Games and inspiring and strengthening the third sector</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td>Funded by LOCOG and supported by Games sponsors and volunteer organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire</td>
<td>Promotes non-commercial projects that promote participation in legacy areas by officially recognising them</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Department for Culture, Media and Sport</td>
<td>Committed funding of £1.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring Sustainable Living</td>
<td>Four projects that will use the Games to inspire sustainable living among individuals and communities up to and beyond the Games</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>The Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs has given start-up funding of £200,000 to each project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE
1 Some projects receive no additional Olympic funding. The Government Olympic Executive was unable to provide figures for funding of all programmes.

Source: National Audit Office analysis of Olympic Legacy Board papers
13.1. The Mayor of London is responsible for London’s overarching activities under the London 2012 Programme. Delivery of these is spread across the GLA Group including the Greater London Authority, Transport for London, the London Development Agency (until its closure on the 31st of March 2012), the Metropolitan Police Service, the London Fire Service and from April 2012 the London Legacy Development Corporation. The focus of this review has been on the Greater London Authority as the primary policy setting agency within the GLA Group. The former Mayor’s commitments to the Games were published in 2008:

- Increasing opportunities for Londoners to become involved in sport;
- Ensuring Londoners benefit from new jobs, business and volunteering opportunities;
- Transforming the heart of East London;
- Delivering a sustainable Games and developing sustainable communities;
- Showcasing London as a diverse, creative and welcoming city.

13.2. These commitments have been retained by the current Mayor and are either focused directly on legacy or have a legacy strand. The GLA’s resourcing for this work includes a team with dedicated support to fulfil each commitment. These are addressed separately below.

13.3. Importantly, from 1st April 2012, the functions of the GLA will change considerably to absorb a significant delivery component to its role. In anticipation of the closure of the LDA, under the Mayor, the GLA has taken on its responsibilities as well as handling a range of new functional areas, resulting in a four-fold increase in budget and a need for internal realignment for the organisation to suitably fit-for-purpose for this new role. This is an important new dimension in the GLA’s role and in its capacity to optimise its own learning legacy from the 2012 Programme.

13.4. The Mayor’s sports strategy – PlaySport London

13.4.1. To bring an appropriate focus to sport’s participation in London, the Mayor appointed Kate Hoey as Commissioner for Sport. The Commissioner’s remit is specifically focused on grass-roots sports participation. The Mayor’s Sports Legacy Programme includes £15.5m of LDA funds over three years to March 2012 for community sporting facilities and activities, and includes funds allocated across three areas:

- Facilities (£5.5m)
- Skills programme (£3m)
- Sports participation fund (£4m)

13.4.2. The Programme is reaching young people who would otherwise not play sport, including through innovative projects such as using a mobile swimming pool within schools to teach young people to swim, a programme of competitive sport for young people with severe disabilities and providing funding for community groups to coach young people who might otherwise not have accessed a sporting activity. These programmes appear to be being rolled out successfully and may be having a positive impact on overall sports participation in London (where participation rates are marginally better than the national participation...
rate). The Commission is supportive of the way in which the Mayor’s fund has been targeted and considers the programme to be highly innovative in reaching those who are less likely to participate in sport.

13.5. **Ensuring Londoners benefit from new jobs, business and volunteering opportunities**

13.5.1. Pending the closure of the LDA, the GLA has assumed responsibility for a number of programmes and funding streams that were managed by that organisation. The GLA is now responsible for monitoring the legacy components of the skills and employment programmes that were previously the remit of the LDA including those created under the London Employment and Skills Taskforce (LEST), as well as overseeing three employment and skills programmes directly.

13.5.2. The GLA’s 2012 employment and skills programme is currently being considered in terms of its legacy beyond 2012-2014. Two of the three projects (2012 Employment Legacy and Host Borough Employment and Skills) are focused on employment opportunities at Games-time and sustained employment opportunities in these sectors, while the Construction Employer Accord has a focus on construction activities on the Olympic Park and other sites across London pre and post-Games. Delivery partners on all three projects are required to provide match funding: in the case of the Host Borough project this will come from a number of sources including Section 106.

13.5.3. These projects mainly target people who are economically inactive (not in work and not on jobseekers allowance). The GLA is looking for sustained employment outcomes for people under these programs (6-12 months post placement). Overall the programmes have a target to support around 5000 people from this economically inactive group into work.

13.5.4. Separately the GLA monitors overall progress towards the London Employment & Skills Taskforce for 2012 (LEST 2012) aspiration to see 70,000 workless Londoners find work as a result of the Games. These fall into a variety of categories:

- Direct jobs associated with Olympic preparation and delivery (e.g. construction jobs with the ODA, Games-time jobs on the Olympic Park)
- Indirect jobs catalysed by the Olympics (e.g construction and end-use jobs at Westfield, where we can demonstrate that winning the Games brought forward the development)
- People supported into work through programmes funded by LDA/GLA or other partners because of/associated with the Olympics (e.g. the current Host Borough Employment and Skills project, Sports National Skills Academy activity)
- Indirect jobs associated with increased visitor numbers to London and other economic growth as a result of the Games.

13.5.5. There is a flexible framework in place for how these outcomes are achieved. Currently the estimate is that this may be under-achieved by approximately 10,000 but in the context of the downturn, and a view that the original aspiration was very ambitious, the GLA consider this good a result. Final outcomes will not be known until some time after the
Games and this may still be able to be improved upon in that time. We support the GLA in this assessment subject to there being a continuation of effort to align and optimise resourcing to achieve as many additional jobs as possible against the outstanding outcomes.

13.5.6. The Construction Employer Accord aims to work with employers to identify entry level opportunities and provides site based coordination to match people to vacancies. (This is a pan-London programme but draws strongly on the ODA, LOCOG and the OPLC – also linking to projects like Crossrail). This programme is due to complete in 2013/14.

13.5.7. While there is currently no additional funding available for any of the GLA 2012 Employment and Skills projects beyond their end date (between 2012-14), the GLA is looking to work closely with the OPLC and the Host Boroughs to address similar aims going forward, as part of an overall commitment to the convergence agenda, which aspires for the Host Boroughs to be in line with the London average on a number of key indicators by 2030. The substantive issues relating to employment and skills are addressed under this theme in section 15. However, the Commission recognises that the GLA’s remit and role to oversee the employment and skills outlook in London means that it will seek to ensure that other areas in London which require focussed intervention (and which have not yet received it) may be prioritised in future, and that a continued focus on East London is not necessarily appropriate in this context.

13.6. Transforming the heart of East London

13.6.1. The GLA’s strategic responsibilities for regenerating East London span the Mayor’s planning powers and objectives through to the Mayor’s active support of the creation of the new London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) and its role in supporting governance for London 2012 initiatives. The GLA has recently carried out public consultation on its Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance which covers part of the Lower Lea Valley and incorporates the entire area for the future LLDC.

13.6.2. In October 2011 the Mayor separately published a statement setting out his proposals for the LLDC following consultation earlier in 2011. This document is the most comprehensive description of the proposed LLDC and was the basis for the Mayor’s formal designation of the Mayoral development area in February 2012. The detailed proposals for the LLDC are not the subject of this review. We have accepted the need for the LLDC to be established. Our focus is on the operational readiness of the OPLC to take up the responsibility of owning and managing the Park, and its role with respect to its wider operational boundaries once it is incorporated into the LLDC. These matters are covered under section 9 on the OPLC. The SPG in setting spatial strategic direction for the Olympic Legacy area is broadly acceptable to the Commission. There are a range of specific issues which we understand have been raised as part of the consultation by the London Sustainable Development Commission and we do not propose to repeat those here. Our proposal for a refreshed vision for East London, and a Valley-wide approach are able to be broadly accommodated within the scope of this SPG and the Upper Lea OAPF.
13.6.3. The GLA also has a responsibility to provide support and leadership for the supra-organisational governance occurring to support legacy in East London. The East London Legacy Board (ELLB) was set up by Government and responsibility for leadership of the Board was transferred to the GLA in December 2010. The GLA undertook a review of the operation of both the ELLB (which comprised elected boroughs, and Government members) and the ELLB Executive Group (an officer level group) and decided that both should be streamlined into a single East London Legacy Group (ELLG) which would become an officer-level group that reports to the existing Olympic Park Regeneration Steering Group (OPRSG). OPRSG is a political-level group chaired by the Mayor which meets quarterly.

13.6.4. The GLA has advised that the ELLG will remain active post 2012. The Group meets every 4-6 weeks, although the intention is for the ELLG to stand down in April or June until after the Games, when it will re-convene. The ELLG was the primary mechanism for the collaborative development of the SRF Action Plan to 2015 which was subsequently published. OPRSG held its most recent meeting in December 2011 with intention of reconvening in October 2012.

13.7. Developing a sustainable Games and sustainable communities

13.7.1. The GLA has a range of responsibilities during Games-time which will leave a policy-based legacy for the organisation. The Mayor’s Food Vision is a tangible example of policy which has influenced LOCOG and the wider food industry to make the food supply chain more sustainable. The Mayor’s Food Vision will continue beyond 2012 and stands, along with LOCOG’s Food Policy, as ongoing influencers in sustainable events management including those events which occur on the Park.

13.7.2. The GLA 2012 City Operations Team has also undertaken to achieve certification under the Sustainable Events Management standard BS8901. The GLA will work with the events team to explore the transfer of certification post-Games. The GLA intends to create a working group in January 2012 to share experiences in sustainable events management across the GLA and to determine what other opportunities exist for mainstreaming. The Commission has previously recommended that the certification should be transferred to the events team, and that all GLA official events should be certified.

13.7.3. There are a number of projects which will have a positive legacy for the GLA, these include the legacy of the tools that have been developed under BS8901, the London Ambassadors – volunteer database, the energy efficiency retrofit for Tower Bridge, the trial of the LOCOG carbon foot printing methodology for Hyde Park live site, and the accessibility work on London’s South Bank as well as new accessibility website which enables any venue to be searched for in terms of its accessibility. The GLA has also developed training around accessibility awareness and equalities for hospitality businesses throughout London.

13.7.4. The GLA had embarked on a process of mainstreaming sustainability into its core business shortly after London won the right to host the Games. The Commission now
understands that a process has been developed for effectively integrating consideration of sustainability issues into policy development. The GLA’s enhanced remit now brings new focus to the internal operations of the organisation particularly in relation to sustainable procurement. Prior to the Games, the GLA Group was widely regarded as leading the public sector in terms of sustainable procurement and related policies such as the Mayor’s Food Vision. However it is now clear that the work of the ODA and LOCOG has lifted the bar yet further. This presents both a challenge and an opportunity to the GLA to identify where the bar has been raised and to learn from it. In this, we recognise the transformative power of the Mayor in both meeting his statutory duty to consider sustainability in all that he does, but also in leading from the front in procurement and other key Mayoral functions.

13.7.5. The Commission winds up at the end of March 2013 in accordance with the agreement made by its funders in 2011. We are in agreement with this timeline, recognising that the main work of the Commission will be complete by this date. However, there is a question to be answered over the Commission’s own learning legacy. Among other things, this concerns the intellectual contribution the Commission has made over its tenure, in particular to the concept of strategic assurance of major projects. The GLA, since 2007, has been the auspicing body for the interim and then the established secretariat of the Commission. The GLA has provided a range of in-kind support for the Commission during this time including legal, human resources and procurement services. Prior to and in the course of this review, and in response to a request from the Head of Paid Service of the GLA, the Chair of the Commission has sought views from all the Key Stakeholders on the value or otherwise of the Commission’s function and the question of whether a body providing strategic assurance over the sustainability of major projects is something which belongs to the annuls of history, or is a potentially useful model for the future.
Stakeholders who responded have generally expressed support for this question to be explored further (this includes all the 2012 Key Stakeholders). It would therefore be appropriate in this context for the GLA to explore the concept of strategic sustainability assurance further, preferably with other, wider stakeholders beyond the 2012 Programme which are responsible for commissioning and/or delivery of major projects. To be clear and for the purposes of probity, as the Commission will cease at the end of March 2013, there is no suggestion that the Commission itself or any of its staff should be directly novated into some future body. Indeed it is our view that an entirely fresh approach would need to be taken to ensure any future body is fit-for-purpose.

**Recommendation 8**

That the GLA develop an internal process and identify a suitable resource to collate, synthesise and implement lessons learnt from the 2012 Programme to ensure that the Group continues to lead in sustainable procurement, waste policy, food policy and other relevant functions.

**Recommendation 9**

That the GLA put in place mechanisms to consider whether a potential future model for strategic sustainability assurance could be of benefit for London, potentially with regard to major projects.

---

15 For reasons of propriety, one Key Stakeholder opted not to respond on the grounds that the discussion was not within their remit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of initiative and description</th>
<th>Relevant London 2012 organisation</th>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Procurement Requirement/mechanism</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS 8901</td>
<td>LOCOG ODA TRANSPORT GLA CITY OPERATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Vision</td>
<td>LOCOG GLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon footprint study</td>
<td>LOCOG ODA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Materials Guidelines</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London 2012 Zero Waste Games Vision</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London 2012 Zero Waste Events Protocol</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London 2012 Sustainability Guidelines for Corporate and Public Events</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire Mark</td>
<td>LOCOG DCMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Set</td>
<td>LOCOG DEFRA DFE DH FCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Inspiration</td>
<td>LOCOG DCMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of initiative and description</td>
<td>Relevant London 2012 organisation</td>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Procurement Requirement/mechanism</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREEAM for arenas (bespoke BREEAM for Olympic Park)</td>
<td>ODA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA Code of Construction Practice</td>
<td>ODA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Sourcing Code</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and Inclusion Business Charter</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA Inclusive Design Standards</td>
<td>ODA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCOG Overlay and Access File (not yet published)</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAP online Event Resource Management Plans tool</td>
<td>LOCOG/WRAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAP On-Pack Recycling Label scheme and recycling bin signage</td>
<td>LOCOG/WRAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies on the use of environmentally sensitive materials (HFC and PVC)</td>
<td>ODA LOCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 Legacy – places, people and venues

14.1 Regeneration of East London

14.1.1 Catalysing the regeneration of East London was one of the key motivations behind the London 2012 Olympic bid. This commitment to the legacy of revitalising this deprived area of London was central to the concept of the bid and was expressed in the Olympic and Paralympic Programme Objectives (2006), the Mayor of London’s Five Legacy Commitments (2007) and has been restated in the more recent Government Legacy Plan (2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East London Regeneration Commitments and Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olympic and Paralympic Games Strategic Objective 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maximise the economic, social, health and environmental benefits of the Games for the UK, particularly through regeneration and sustainable development in East London.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Mayor of London Commitment 4** |
| Social, economic and environmental sustainability is at the heart of the London 2012 Games and the future plans for regenerating East London. The Games provide a perfect opportunity to demonstrate, through construction and legacy, how we can change behaviours and manage our resources to ensure a better quality of life for everyone now and for future generations. The Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 will independently assure London’s 2012 pledge to host the most sustainable Games to date. |

| **HM Government Legacy Plan 2010** |
| Ensuring that the Olympic Park can be developed after the Games as one of the principal drivers of regeneration in East London. |

| **London Plan 2011 – Policy 2.4A Strategic** |
| The Mayor will work with partners to develop and implement a viable and sustainable legacy for the Olympic and Paralympic Games to deliver fundamental economic, social and environmental change within east London, and to close the deprivation gap between the Olympic Host Boroughs, and the rest of London. This will be London’s single most important regeneration project for the next 25 years. It will sustain existing stable communities and promote local economic investment to create job opportunities (especially for young people), driven by community engagement. |

14.1.2 The Host Boroughs have highlighted the significance of these commitments in their Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) published in 2009. This states that London won the right to host the Games on the promise of regenerating the entire community for the benefit of everyone who lives there. It is emphasised that this has become the fundamental organising principle for the numerous agencies involved in making the Olympic vision a reality.

14.1.3 The planning for legacy commenced with the 2004 Olympic and Legacy Planning Application. Planning permission was granted in October 2004 for the both the Games facilities and the legacy developments. The so-called 2004 permissions were an integral part of the success of the London bid. The 2004 permissions required the submission
and approval of a Lower Lea Valley Regeneration Strategy to demonstrate how the implementation of the Games could regenerate a wider area in the Lea Valley beyond the Olympic site itself. The Regeneration Strategy was commissioned by the London Development Agency and endorsed by stakeholders in January 2007. It comprised a vision document, the Lower Lea Valley Vision, and the Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework, being Supplementary Planning Guidance under the London Plan. In February 2005, a major planning application for the site of the former Stratford Rail Lands was approved. This is now known as the Stratford City Development. The first phase, encompassing the Westfield shopping centre, opened in September 2011.

14.1.4 In 2007, the Olympic, Paralympic and Legacy Transformation Planning Applications were the next major step towards the development of the Olympic Park and the regeneration of the Lea Valley. These permissions superseded the 2004 permissions as the primary planning permissions for the area. As the designation implies, these permissions cover the site preparation, Olympic and Paralympic developments, and the post-Games transformation. Unlike the 2004 permissions, they do not explicitly deal with the legacy developments.

14.1.5 In the Commitment to Sustainable Regeneration document, which accompanied the 2007 planning application, the ODA and LDA committed to preparing a Legacy Masterplan Framework (LMF) for Olympic Park. This was to include community and stakeholder consultation. In February 2008, the process of developing the LMF was initiated. The task was to develop a framework for a new piece of London with the key agencies and the Host Boroughs. The LMF was accompanied by a series of detailed strategies relating to social infrastructure, housing, employment, leisure and culture, transport, water, waste, strategic sustainability, infrastructure, energy and climate change. The LMF process also generated a series of Area Plans for six distinct character areas within the Olympic Park in legacy (Stratford Waterfront, Olympic Quarter, Old Ford, Hackney Wick East, Stratford Village, and Pudding Mill Lane). The LMF was officially unveiled in February 2009. It envisaged the delivery of 10,500 new homes (in addition to the Olympic Village), three primary schools, a secondary school and a sports academy in the Olympic Stadium. It also projected that 10,000 new jobs would be created.

14.1.6 The Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) was initiated by the Host Boroughs to consider wider regeneration of East London and so that the benefits of the Games would not be confined to the area bounded by the Olympic Park. Work on the SRF commenced in 2008 and was published in October 2009 having been formally agreed by the Olympic Park Regeneration Steering Group. The SRF is founded on specially commissioned research demonstrating the ‘stubborn gap’ between the social outcomes in the Host Boroughs and the rest of London, accounting for the greatest cluster of deprivation in England and Wales. The SRF’s vision is termed the principle of convergence: that is, within 20 years, the communities who host the 2012 Games will enjoy the same social and economic changes as their neighbours across London. This is translated into a series of specific outcome objectives to be achieved by 2015, for instance, 120,000 more residents with jobs and 99,000 fewer residents having no qualifications. The
SRF was backed by a Multi Area Agreement between the Host Boroughs to enable stronger partnership working as well as demonstrating their commitment to other tiers of Government.

14.1.7 The LMF has now been superseded by the latest planning application being taken forward by the Olympic Park Legacy Company and following a number of revisions and a design review. The OPLC has developed its proposed Legacy Communities Scheme to refer to the developments following the post-Games Transformation phase. Transformation involves the modification of Games-time venues, infrastructure and Parklands to enable subsequent legacy development through the Legacy Communities Scheme. The planning application for the Legacy Communities Scheme has been submitted to the Planning Decisions Team of the ODA. The application comprises a suite of documents including a sustainability statement, environment statement, energy statement, interim uses statement and health impact assessment. It is expected the LCS will be determined in June 2012, with legal arrangement signed, and planning permission issued in September 2012.

14.1.8 The London Plan 2011 sets out spatial development policies for the 2012 Games and their legacy. The London Plan recognises the Olympic Park and surrounding areas represent ‘London’s single most important regeneration project for the next 25 years’ (Policy 2.4A). The London Plan states that the Mayor’s priorities are to be set out in an Olympic Supplementary Planning Guidance, which has been prepared in conjunction with the four affected Boroughs, the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation and the ODA. It is stated that the regeneration of the Olympic Park and surrounding areas is the Mayor’s highest regeneration priority (para.2.18).

14.1.9 One concern of local residents and stakeholders is the capacity of local services to meet the increased demand that is expected to arise from new residents in the Village and the new development platforms within the Park, including for schools, nurseries, medical centres and other similar requirements. We understand the OPLC has consulted with the Boroughs over the ‘Vision and Convergence Statement’ that was submitted as part of the LCS Reg22 submission, setting out the organisation’s approach to maximising linkages between new social infrastructure and the surrounding communities. The OPLC is adamant that capacity studies undertaken demonstrate that the planned additional services to be built within the development will be sufficient and that phasing of these facilities will be appropriate. Indeed, the OPLC altered plans to ensure that these new services could be accessed by existing communities, by placing them towards the edge of the Park rather than in central areas. However, the question of phasing of new facilities is likely to remain pertinent as long as the phasing of development platforms is subject to market forces.

Wider impacts and benefits

14.1.10 Work to translate the SRF into tangible outcomes is being coordinated through the Olympic Park Regeneration Steering Group and the East London Legacy Group. The Olympic Park Regeneration Steering Group (OPRSG) considered and endorsed the
Convergence Action Plan 2011-15 at its December 2011 meeting and this has now been published. This Action Plan includes a range of tangible actions to progress the SRF against its three streams. Work supporting this process includes the Oxford Economics’ economic model for the Host Boroughs which identifies significant growth potential if partners can work together to achieve the required uplift in economic outcomes. The Model has been endorsed by Treasury and the Mayor.

14.1.11 Work is underway to consider how to optimise development opportunities in this context. On an annual basis the OPRSG will receive and consider a report on the achievements/progress of each of the three SRF Theme Groups in turn.

14.1.12 Another stream of work to be delivered as part of realising the economic potential of the Host Boroughs is promoting Strategic Marketing Opportunities for East London (led by private sector). The Action Plan and high level narrative for this work were both agreed in December by the OPRSG.

14.1.13 The wider impact of the development of the Park and Stratford City, along with the arrival of Crossrail, the new transport link, in terms of the requirement for and the provision of jobs, housing, services and amenity is difficult to quantify. There remains concern among some quarters that Stratford’s regeneration will simply result in the gentrification of its communities and neighbourhoods, ensuring that poor families leave the area for cheaper locales. The SRF does not shy away from this possibility, recognising that some injection of wealth into the area is needed to provide a greater mix of socio-economic
strata. However, it does recognise that for the regeneration effort to benefit local people, jobs and training need to be matched to local capacity, affordable and socially rented housing must be part of the regeneration picture, and work with the existing community is required to engage them in the change-making process. It is heartening to see that the OPLC will monitor the degree of churn in employment generated via its contracts. This is a key indicator of the degree to which people are successful in holding onto employment but also an indirect indication of the extent to which people are making the area their long-term home. We would encourage the OPLC to consider how else they can monitor and support existing communities to stay in the area, rather than succumb to gentrification.

14.1.14 The OPLC is an important, albeit a small part of the entire regeneration agenda for the Lower Lea, and the LLDC with its wider boundary will still only take in a portion of the area around the Park. Other players are crucial in the broader regeneration agenda including private sector partners, the boroughs, the Mayor and Government, NGOs and the community sector, the community itself and small to medium sized businesses.

14.1.15 The role of housing organisations including the Village consortia Triathlon Homes is vital in negotiating with partners for better outcomes for future residents of social and affordable housing schemes. Triathlon Homes has successfully negotiated for homes in the Village to be indistinguishable by tenure – a crucial first step in avoiding social isolation and stigma. The process of creating a new community within the Village is also one which is delicate and which requires care. We understand that Triathlon is seeking a longer hand-over period for new units as they are completed by the ODA to avoid a ‘lettings-jam’ of new tenants, removal vans, a building up of discarded packing materials, and insufficient time for staff to deal with any teething problems that may arise.

14.1.16 The build-out of the remaining development in Stratford City is not yet formally scheduled by Westfield. We understand that there is significant commercial capacity still to be built as well as remaining retail and some residential. While it is understandable in the current climate that this development has not been locked into a development cycle, the sooner a timeframe is determined, the greater certainty can be provided to surrounding service providers and transport managers.

14.1.17 The Westfield Stratford City development comes with considerable section 106 requirements for new jobs to be created for local people and for the long-term unemployed. This is addressed in more detail under section 15. The benefits of the development to the area, other than jobs, includes the provision of a vibrant shopping precinct, additional restaurants, and additional visitors coming to Stratford and passing through the existing shopping centre on their way to Stratford City. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the impact of Westfield on the existing centre has been to date largely positive.

14.1.18 The Westfield development also contains a casino, which is prominently advertised. It is understood that the casino provides a large number of jobs in the borough and has
contracted to contribute a significant proportion of profits to good causes in Newham, which is welcomed. However, there is a high degree of social deprivation in Newham. We urge Newham Council to monitor the social effects of the new casino, and in particular whether it is associated with any increase in problem gambling, and be prepared to take action should evidence of harm emerge.

**Environmental impacts**

14.1.19 Should the regeneration of Stratford deliver the economic results intended, not all of the impacts are likely to be positive. One of the obvious questions that comes with increasing economic activity is whether it is in danger of becoming a victim of its own success in terms of generating transport and traffic congestion and fuelling gentrification of the surrounding neighbourhoods. Some stakeholders have commented on the need to avoid the ‘West London congestion scenario’ occurring in the East. Decoupling economic success from other indicators of activity (like carbon emissions for example) is extremely difficult and there are very few examples of where it has been achieved successfully. The Borough’s SRF plan, while focussing on closing the gap, could be complemented by a stream of work which considers how to achieve the economic growth the region needs, but in a way that does not lead to a lock-step increase in emissions, energy use, congestion and other attendant environmental challenges. It is noted here that the Mayor has produced a Transport Legacy Action Plan and that TfL is working with the boroughs to continue to improve strategic connections in East London. This work is a step in the right direction in this regard.

14.2 **Creation of Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park**

* Sustainability and Design Principles of Planning Application*

14.2.1 The most recent planning application incorporated a Legacy Communities Scheme which supersedes the previous LMF. The Communities Scheme includes extensive design guidelines, a series of housing typologies, a comprehensive approach to precinct design and a clear understanding of connectivity and accessibility. The application also includes a sustainability statement which sets out the minimum levels the development will achieve against a range of measures.

14.2.2 We have already mentioned the Park Plan in section 9 and are pleased to report that an independent Quality Review Panel is being established that will include design experts in the fields of architecture, urban design, landscape architecture, and which will review the Park Plan as set out in the LCS Design and Access Statement.16

14.2.3 The urban design principles, set out by the LCS are broadly credible and largely workable. There have been major changes introduced as a result of the feedback from the last LMF review and in this respect the OPLC is to be commended. A key objective is to create a new piece of London. The LCS proposes ‘a model of urban development based upon an integrated network of locally-scaled streets, squares and gardens, combined with a range

---

16  DAS p20, 1.4.2 Delivering Design Quality
of residential types tuned to the requirements of East London’s present and anticipated needs, and the building standards of the 21st century’.

14.2.4 As sites come forward developers will challenge the more laudable aspirations of the Master plan and value engineer it down, insofar as possible. ‘Creating sustainable legacy communities’ was a key promise in the Olympic bid. It is therefore important that the Commission looks beyond the LCS’s broad principles and scrutinizes the detail of the plan to test the sustainability merits of the planning application and commitments therein.

14.2.5 The LMF went through a process of professional review in the form of an intensive ‘design charrette’ with a number of design professionals. Whilst this process is mentioned in the Design and Access Statement, the outcomes of the review are not clear. There is little doubt that the ‘charrette’ and the good work of the ODA’s (Evolution Phase) has benefited the outcome because there is a marked improvement. The revised REG22 submission shows a commitment to the creation of neighbourhoods that utilise diverse housing typologies. We understand in this regard that the LCS and its design codes were reviewed by CABE in April, July and September of 2011. CABE has also provided further comment as a non statutory consultee in its response to the LCS September Outline Planning Application.

14.2.6 The OPLC is currently recruiting a Design Quality Panel to assess schemes as they come forward. This is a welcome initiative, as local panels have added considerable value across London. Experts, from a wide background, including sustainability and accessibility should be encouraged to participate. We are also aware that the organisation is taking forward the ODA’s Built Environment Access Panel (BEAP) which will assist the organisation in implementing its inclusive design policy.

LCS Headline Sustainability Commitments

14.2.7 The Commission notes that a number of headline environmental sustainability commitments will be largely delivered through the Site-Wide Design Codes and PDZ Specific Design Codes. Therefore, it will be important that these documents are sufficiently robust to deliver these promises/commitments, as the Codes will be used to challenge the LPA in the future, as developments come forward.

14.2.8 We note that the Sustainability Statement focuses on environmental sustainability and that further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement, Housing and Social Infrastructure Statement, Employment Statement, Equalities Impact Assessment and the Health Impact Assessment.

14.2.9 In developing the LCS, the proposed land uses for the five new neighbourhoods have been set out spatially. A range of housing choices and employment opportunities are promised along with a range of facilities to create “walkable” neighbourhoods that support the local community’s needs. There is a significant opportunity here to achieve these aspirations given the owner and long-term stewardship of the Park lies with the Legacy Company.
14.2.10 The ‘redline boundaries’ have been drawn to exclude the venues. It is accepted that the future of the venues may be unknown or as in the case of the Velodrome and likely the Aquatics Centre, is or will be under separate ownership. Nonetheless, the interface between the ‘neighbourhoods’ and venues need to be clearly understood insofar as possible because this is a key relationship in terms of developing successful sustainable communities. At present, there is insufficient information to assist Stakeholders with the assessment of the spatial and land use relationships between the neighbourhoods and venues, including what will become the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park as well as the Olympic Village and Stratford City.

**Site-Wide and Planning Delivery Zone Design Codes**

14.2.11 The use of Design Codes, which set out the key design principles of LCS on both a site-wide basis as well as on a Planning Delivery Zone (PDZ) or neighbourhood basis, is most welcomed. The Design Codes will be a useful and meaningful tool to support the aspiration to create, sustainable, legible communities.

14.2.12 The site-wide codes support key and widely accepted principles, such as promoting: ecology, rain gardens, green roofs, landscaping and cycling. Sustainable construction techniques are encouraged: homes are to be built to a minimum of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. Whilst these initiatives are commendable, in our view the design codes do not convey on their own the principles of sustainable neighbourhoods in their broadest sense. However, we recognise that they need to be read in conjunction with the suite of planning documents including the Design and Access Statement, the Sustainability Statement, Green Infrastructure Strategy, Employment Statement and the Transport Assessment. While there is one school of thought which argues for greater regulation in design requirements as part of the design codes, we are aware that the OPLC is of the view it is for developers to respond creatively to the commitments and objectives made across the suite of planning documents, first through their tender proposals and when they submit their reserved matters applications. We urge the organisation to closely monitor quality of design in this regard, and in particular character and variety of housing typologies, achieving quality private amenity space including the use of recessed balconies and winter gardens, daylighting/solar access and the capacity to provide car-free development.

**Interim use strategy**

14.2.13 We have highlighted that the OPLC is to develop an Interim Uses Strategy through an innovative and embracing process with the community and other stakeholders. We believe that the strategy holds the key to whether the community will feel the Park is something they ‘own’ or not. We understand the OPLC is considering the development of a community land trust to own or manage some assets or land on the Park as part of the Interim Uses Strategy. We strongly encourage this approach as a firm way of bringing the community into the heart of the Park’s activities.
14.2.14 As we have already stated, we believe the organisation needs to establish some underlying principles to guide the development of the strategy. Sustainability should be at the core of these so that the outcomes are not detrimental to the long-term future of the Park or the community.

**Connectivity**

14.2.15 The OPLC has recognised that the Park’s level of connectivity is currently not as good as it could be into legacy. The Communities Scheme incorporates a number of new connections to try and rectify this. However, concerns remain that connectivity to the north eastern side of the Park remains constrained and that more could be done particularly for cyclists and pedestrians.

**Transformation**

14.2.16 Parts of the Park are to be completely closed to the public up to May 2014, but with an intended staged opening from summer 2013 so that venues within the Park and the Park itself can be transformed into its legacy uses. Many stakeholders are concerned about the degree to which the Park will be locked-down up to first opening in 2013 and have highlighted the message this will send to the community. We understand that the OPLC is developing an extensive engagement strategy for this phase (which the organisation is calling ‘Clear, Connect, Complete’ and we encourage the OPLC
to continue exploring ways in which it can carry out the transformation in ways which either shorten the time the Park is completely off-limits, or which provide limited access to elements of the Park, sooner than May 2013.

### 14.3 Games Venues

14.3.1 The Games are being held in venues centred in the Park and in venues primarily around London. The exceptions to this are the sailing which is occurring at Weymouth, the mountain bike racing which is occurring and Hadleigh Farm, the white water rafting which is occurring at Lea Valley White Water Centre, the football which is occurring in venues around the UK and the rowing which is occurring at Eton Dorney. Other than the venue used for the rowing and the football stadia, these venues have been enhanced or constructed specifically to support hosting the Games in 2012. They are all permanent venues, although Hadleigh Farm will undergo some significant post-Games alterations to ensure it is operational in legacy mode.

14.3.2 The Commission has commented previously about the White Water Centre and Weymouth, (which we have summarised below). Hadleigh Farm is a working farm owned primarily by the Salvation Army and currently managed by Essex County Council. It is intended that a part of the farm will be managed into legacy as a mountain biking venue. The Salvation Army will however need to formalise plans for the venue in legacy mode as the Games-time course is considered to be too difficult to be safe for most mountain bikers.

14.3.3 The farm contains a range of rare and protected species and habitats which have been adequately protected for the Games-time event. We understand that Natural England is quietly confident that Essex County Council in conjunction with the Salvation Army will be able to continue to provide adequate management of the farm as a whole, including as a working farm, a mountain biking venue, and as a location where rare and protected species can continue to be found.

14.3.4 LOCOG and the ODA in the course of providing effective enhancement and overlay for venues, such as the rowing at Eton Dorney, Hadleigh and Weymouth, have inspired a range of positive enhancements to the natural environment in surrounding areas. One example is the work being undertaken by Eton College on its land adjoining the Rowing venue. We understand this work is largely going uncelebrated as it is not within LOCOG’s core remit, yet it is an important part of the wider legacy that is evolving for communities, landowners and wider stakeholders who are involved directly or indirectly in hosting Games activities.

14.3.5 While the Inspire Mark programme aimed to capture and recognise initiatives that have been inspired by the 2012 Games, there will remain initiatives which did not meet Inspire Mark guidelines or which did not apply for recognition. It will be important for local venue owners to publicise their own legacy in this regard, and for legacy holders, to consider how these could receive a more informal platform within the learning legacy agenda.
14.3.6 We have already commented earlier in this review on the legacy benefits of LOCOG’s physical overlay and in particular its assets which it has employed during Games-time.

14.3.7 We recognise that in this, LOCOG has done much to capture venue-based legacy, however, we draw attention to our recommendation from our 2009 Annual Review where we said:

‘that LOCOG continue to explore opportunities with legacy owners and the sport community to ensure the optimum long term benefit is achieved in lease/buy decisions.’

14.3.8 The ODA is responsible for a number of the temporary venues also. In particular the Basketball stadium, the temporary swimming pools and the water polo stadium. These have all been designed to be able to be reused either in toto or in their component parts. This is an excellent potential legacy and we strongly encourage the ODA to find optimal reuse opportunities for them.

14.3.9 The permanent venues on the Olympic Park all demonstrate considerable sustainability benefits, including energy and water efficiency, effective use of recycled materials as well as a range of measures to improve indoor air quality and health. With all venues achieving BREEAM Very Good or Excellent, these venues set new benchmarks for venues of the future. Yet there is no doubt that sustainability performance could be improved. Of course, it is important that the lessons, missed opportunities and challenges are recognised for the benefit of future venue design and implementation. One clear lesson is that embedding sustainability objectives and targets early into the procurement process allows designers the room to avoid conflicts and tradeoffs in favour of smart design where genuine alternatives provide a more sustainable solution. One clear example of where early specification could have produced a more cost-effective result is the missed opportunity to specify HFC-free HVAC for all venues which required artificial cooling, heating and ventilation. The retrofit of this form of HVAC to the Aquatics Centre cost the ODA more than it had planned, while the Stadium design was not able to be retrofit with HFC free technology without compromising other sustainability goals.

14.3.10 Ownership of venues within the Park post 2012 is split between the OPLC and the Lea Valley Regional Park Authority. The OPLC will own the Multi-Use Arena, the Stadium, the Aquatic Centre and the Community Track. The Lea Valley Regional Park Authority will own the VeloPark, the Tennis Centre, the Hockey Centre and the Eton Manor site. As we have already noted, there is an obvious need to ensure there is an integrated and seamless approach to visiting the Park, regardless of management or ownership of individual venues and it is pleasing to see that the OPLC has recognised this as a key priority.
15 Sustainability themes

15.1. Climate Change

Overview, policy and structure

15.1.1. Climate Change is one of the London 2012 overarching sustainability themes. It encompasses climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation. It, like other themes, is something which concerns multiple stakeholders. Nationally, the Government introduced the Climate Change Act in 2008 which sets legally binding targets to reduce carbon by 80% by 2050 including an interim target of 34% by 2020, in addition to a range of other supporting measures. The Code for Sustainable Homes embeds carbon mitigation and adaption measures into requirements for new homes built in the UK. Statutory agencies such as Natural England, the Environment Agency and British Waterways are all vitally concerned with the impacts of climate change, in particular in relation to flood risk and flood risk mitigation as well as the impact on biodiversity.

15.1.2. The Mayor of London has embedded carbon mitigation and climate change adaptation into the London Plan, as well as in the London Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy and the Mayor’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategy. These set a carbon mitigation target of 60% of 1990 levels by 2025, and a strategic risk management approach to climate change adaptation.

Previous Commission thematic reviews

15.1.3. The Commission addressed one element of this cross-cutting theme in its 2009 review of Carbon (CSL 2009). Environmental related climate change adaptation has also been addressed previously in the Commission’s Biodiversity Review. The health-related impacts of climate change and their socio-economic implications have not been directly addressed by this Commission previously.

15.1.4. The London 2012 Programme recognised the important of Climate Change in identifying it as one of five key sustainability themes which have driven sustainability throughout the Programme. Venues have all been designed to reduce energy-in-use and where possible, to reduce the carbon footprint of the materials used in construction, and the carbon footprint of the construction phase itself. The Olympic Park has contributed to major flood risk mitigation in East London through the lowering and widening of the Lea’s banks, while the CCHP system ensures a highly efficient mode of energy generation and delivery as well as a precinct-wide system which can be enhanced in legacy mode.

Carbon Review 2009
Each individual Key Stakeholder should be responsible for reducing or avoiding emissions within their area of responsibility. The Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 has a responsibility to assure this activity.

Carbon Review 2009
The reference footprint should be recalculated and published on a regular basis. Assumptions should be explicitly stated to ensure openness and transparency.
Progress

15.1.5. The legacy of the ODA’s decision to abate energy use through two community retrofit programmes, rather than through meeting its original 20% renewable energy target is one which has unanticipated outcomes for the OPLC. While the Commission agreed with the ODA’s decision to abate energy use in this way at the time, the impact of there being no substantial renewable infrastructure on-site is only now being considered. The opportunity to install large-scale infrastructure of this kind has now passed and the OPLC will need to seek other opportunities to abate carbon and energy on-site. This has the potential to be limited to the capacity for the CCHP to be operated from clean-sourced fuels. However, we have already indicated to the OPLC that we believe more could be done to explore the generation of electricity on the Park either as a separate contract to that with Cofely (which is an exclusive right to provide heat to the Park), or as an extension to this contract under fair procurement rules. In this regard, we are pleased that OPLC is already considering innovations in this area, and is also looking at opportunities to further retrofit venues with renewable technology. Technologies exist and are being improved all the time which could be considered within or outside of the existing contractual arrangements. These include but are certainly not limited to:

- Canal water heat rejection cooling for new canal-side development;
- Micro-hydro at locks;
- Thin-film solar photovoltaic applications;
- Building integrated photovoltaic applications where these can be incorporated as cladding material;
- Hydrogen fuel cell technology;
- Biofuel generation from municipal and commercial waste and other biomass;
- On-site or near-site anaerobic digester for food waste (with knock-on improvements for water quality and sewage management due to reduced throughput of food waste into the sewage and sewage overflow system).

15.1.6. There is always a tension in exploring carbon and climate change mitigation measures about the extent to which technology is mainstreamed, and widely commercially available. The upfront costs of installation can also be prohibitive. Yet, there many examples in cities around the world of an appropriate balance being struck between innovation, commercial reality and benefiting from new technology as it becomes mainstreamed. One of the key elements to exploring the economics of renewable technology is being able to structure financial and governance arrangements which smoothes the long-run marginal costs across beneficiaries and consumers. The OPLC has an opportunity to explore an appropriate model so that unit-costs are considered against the medium to long term value rather than against today’s energy market.

15.1.7. The water, waste and transport infrastructure could all be optimised to reflect site-wide sustainability principles and smart technology, alongside the energy infrastructure necessary to support it. Lighting, HVAC, way finding, pumping and logistics are all needed for the Park and their delivery can be viewed in terms of an unsustainable liability, or an opportunity to save materials, space, energy and water and as well as on cost in the long term. Smart grid
technology in this light could provide an effective way to optimise technology and the grid to minimise energy losses, provide effective two-way flow of energy across the grid, and enhance grid-based energy storage opportunities leading to an overall reduction in energy consumption and a flatter energy profile.

15.1.8. There is also an extremely important role for the natural environment within the Park and right along the River Lea to act as a natural sink for carbon emissions. Trees and other plants absorb carbon dioxide and many can fix other important nutrients into the soil – improving its quality and capacity to perform its nutrient delivery and pollutant filtration role. Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Principles support and inform this function (see Biodiversity section below for more detail). Some forms of carbon and energy management can actively promote this nutrient fixing role for soil by sequestering carbon back into the soil through prolepsis and gasification of biomass material. A virtuous cycle can be established where biomass material used to generate energy also produces a carbon rich bi-product known as bio char which is then used to enrich soil so more biomass can be grown and harvested. This kind of technology is being exploited now and could potentially be deployed in the upper Lea.

15.1.9. Under a future climate which is hotter and drier, commercial and residential buildings will require greater cooling, unless they are designed to optimise passive cooling into the future. For the medium term, heating in winter is still a requirement and this can also be substantially reduced through building design. The Commission has previously made it clear to the OPLC that we believe there is an urgent need for the organisation to set out a road map for how it will achieve a higher level of commitment against key sustainability areas including the Code for Sustainable Homes, but also in consenting future commercial development on the Park. We are pleased to see that its draft sustainability policy goes further than before in setting out this roadmap. As we have mentioned elsewhere in this report, we are pleased that the draft policy includes a commitment to 100% zero carbon homes, with 75% of this commitment to be met on-site and a further 25% through allowable solutions off-site. We would like to see greater detail about the proposed plans for off-site solutions to ensure they will provide genuine additionality and support for local communities. We would also like to see the organisation to commit to meeting the 100% zero carbon target on-site eventually and therefore a timeframe for this will be important. We recognise that this is a significant challenge and it may be that this can only be met with the addition of deeper sustainability gains through energy infrastructure which may mean it can only be scheduled in latter years. With some greater clarity on timeframes and with the addition of an express commitment to meet its 100% zero carbon target on-site over time, the OPLC’s sustainability policy will represent world-leading practice.

15.2. Biodiversity

Overview, policy and structure

15.2.1. Policy governing the management of biodiversity is driven through a range of mechanisms nationally and at regional and local level. A number of statutory bodies have regulatory
responsibilities including Natural England, the Environment Agency, British Waterways and Thames Water that relate directly or indirectly to the management of biodiversity.

15.2.2. The National Government’s policy agenda is framed by Planning Policy Statement 9 on Biodiversity and Geological Conservation which states that ‘local development frameworks should identify any areas or sites for the restoration or creation of new priority habitats which contribute to regional targets, and support this restoration or creation through appropriate policies’ The UK Biodiversity Action Plan 1994 set out a programme for preserving the UK’s biodiversity. The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 reinforces this policy intent, by placing responsibility on every public authority to conserve biodiversity.

15.2.3. The current Government has set out its future direction for managing natural environments through a White Paper, entitled, Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature (2011)17 which includes a number of new initiatives, including the concept of biodiversity offsetting, as well as measures to help the natural environment adapt to climate change and actions to safeguard important habitats. The White Paper also draws on the concept of Green Infrastructure.

15.2.4. In addition, the Government’s ‘Biodiversity 2020 Strategy A strategy for England’s wildlife and ecosystem services’18 provides guidance on ecosystem services and conservation to meet an ambition to halt ecosystem loss by 2020.

15.2.5. Natural England has produced guidance on the use of Green Infrastructure, which defines it as:

‘Green Infrastructure (GI) is a strategically planned and delivered network of high quality green spaces and other environmental features. It should be designed and managed as a multifunctional resource capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities.’19

15.2.6. The work to regenerate Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park and its Green Infrastructure Strategy provides a springboard to secure green infrastructure for the length of the Lea Valley and to build on the creation of the Lee Valley Regional Park in the 1960s. The Environment Agency, British Waterways and Natural England are working to actively pursue ways to achieve this and ensure the benefits – ecosystem services – that result from green infrastructure, which includes waterways. These benefits cover health and wellbeing for communities and increased connectivity between communities, alongside flood alleviation and climate change mitigation as well as increased biodiversity.

15.2.7. The Mayor’s London Plan incorporates commitments to protect biodiversity, and he has issued guidance on Trees and Woodlands, and Better Green and Water Spaces20, as well, the former Mayor’s guidance on London’s Green Grid and an SPG on Green Roofs

17 http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/natural/whitepaper/  
is still extant. At local level, authorities have the responsibility to enforce biodiversity commitments made through planning applications.

15.2.8. The Lea Valley Regional Park Authority has statutory powers covering leisure sport and recreation and including environmental conservation for the Regional Park. The LVRPA vision and business plan has the stated aim of transforming the Regional Park into a world class visitor destination by 2020. The Park contains eight areas of Special Scientific Significance and parts of the Park are recognised as of internationally important wetland habitat under the Ramsar convention.

15.2.9. The London Sustainable Development Commission recently published ‘Sowing the Seeds’ which sets out research and recommendations on ways in which London’s children can be reconnected with nature.

15.2.10. The Olympic Board approved biodiversity as one of the programme’s five sustainability themes in June 2006. The Olympic Park Biodiversity Action Plan was published in October 2008, and biodiversity protection and enhancement is a key feature of many of the off-Park venue agreements. Chief among the commitments contained in the BAP is the requirement for a minimum of 45 hectares of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) of at least Borough Grade 1 Standard develops within the Olympic Park, which replaces 42.47ha of SINC that existed on the site prior to its development.

Previous Commission thematic review

15.2.11. The Commission published its review of Biodiversity in November 2010, entitled ‘Sustainable? Naturally…’ The Commission made a total of 8 recommendations, 3 of which pertain to the legacy period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Biodiversity review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the habitats that are developed in legacy are in line with the habitat commitments set out in the Olympic Park Biodiversity Action Plan, providing a mix of appropriate accessible, natural habitats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Biodiversity review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the body or bodies responsible for the Olympic Park in legacy set out and implement clear plans for how the habitat will be maintained, managed and monitored to ensure that a minimum of 45 ha of SINC of at least Borough Grade 1 standard develops within the Olympic Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Biodiversity review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the ODA review existing procedures and controls to ensure they are suitable for managing the habitats during Park Operations and Transformation. This needs to ensure that the habitats and species present on the Park are safeguarded, protected and enhanced and that the biodiversity of the Park is monitored during these phases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


22 [http://www.cslondon.org/publications/?category=1&PHPSESSID=ab0d17ac794f6ccf5d4b7d17ccbecad43&did=67](http://www.cslondon.org/publications/?category=1&PHPSESSID=ab0d17ac794f6ccf5d4b7d17ccbecad43&did=67)
Current sustainability challenges

15.2.12. We have been advised by the OPLC that it will commit to meeting the requirement for 45 hectares of SINC to be met on the Park. However, we are aware that the recent planning application excised the Stadium and other parts of the site such as some of the land around VeloPark from consideration because it was the subject of a separate future application to transform it into its legacy capacity. This meant that it was not possible to see where all 45 hectares would come from. Since that time, the Stadium procurement has been halted and the OPLC will instead retain ownership of the venue. This provides even greater opportunity for the organisation to control and manage its achievement of biodiversity habitat and the Commission is pleased to see this commitment in its forthcoming sustainability strategy. The OPLC is also required to deliver 102 hectares of Metropolitan Open Land which in our view should be as high quality as possible, rather than simply comprising amenity grass. We reported in our biodiversity review that the 209 transformation plans showed an increase in species-rich grassland and Parks, squares and amenity spaces and a decrease in trees and scrub and brownfield habitat. This was largely driven by the need to have multi-functional spaces that can provide amenity areas as well as natural habitats. The Commission would be very disappointed to see any further decreases in what might be considered the more natural habitats as it is these types of habitats that are particularly uncommon in the area.

15.2.13. There is a considerable opportunity for the biodiversity of the Park to be enhanced in the medium term through the Interim Uses Strategy, which will cover the entire development period (beyond 15 years). Environmental stakeholders are keen for this strategy to, as a minimum, maintain existing opportunities for biodiversity, but to aspire to enhance biodiversity on the Park during this period.

15.3. Waste

Overview, policy and structure

15.3.1. Waste is one of the five cross-cutting sustainability themes for the London 2012 Programme. It is a significant challenge, not only in terms of solid waste, but also sewage, and greywater. The National Government has established waste policy guidelines through Planning Policy Statement 10 which sets out what should be taken into account by waste authorities (which typically have a remit covering municipal waste). The Mayor of London has the primary planning powers for new waste infrastructure and this is encapsulated within the London Plan. Separately, the

Recycled water reticulation on the Park © Jonathan Turner
Mayor has set out his policy for municipal waste in the London’s Draft Waste Strategy. Implementation is the responsibility of the individual boroughs along with the sub-regional waste authorities. In East London Newham Council is part of the East London Waste Authority (ELWA) along with Barking and Dagenham, Redbridge and Havering. Hackney Council is part of North London Waste Authority whereas Tower Hamlets is not a member of any Waste Authority. Funding for new waste infrastructure is provided through the London Waste and Recycling Board (LWARB) which was established by the Mayor in 2007.

15.3.2. Management of sewerage is the responsibility of Thames Water in East London. A significant challenge for the management of effluent flows in London is typically the dual connection of sewer and surface-water run-off, creating a far larger volume of effluent than is necessary. The separation of surface water run-off from the sewer network was one of the key design principles supporting the Olympic Park, the Olympic Village and embedded in the development platforms within the Park.

*Previous Commission thematic review*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Waste Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the London 2012 Sustainability Group set out how the management of waste and resources in the post-Games bump-out/breakdown phase and subsequent transformation phase will be co-ordinated and where responsibility will lie. This encompasses the operations of City Operations, HMG, LOCOG and the ODA and how they will all maximise reuse of materials. This needs to: (i) include how responsibility for the end use of temporary materials, demolition and construction materials will be coordinated; (ii) have as its main objective the sale and reuse of these materials, including setting a specific target for reuse, then the recycling and recovery of materials, according to the optimal option in carbon terms for the specific item or material; (iii) take reasonable endeavours to reuse or recycle at least 90 per cent, by weight, of the material arising from the installation and deconstruction of temporary venues, equipment and overlay; (iv) be set out as soon as possible in order to be able to influence decisions relating to all operational aspects, including logistics, transport, regulatory compliance, security, and health and safety; (v) report on progress and present a final report to the Olympic Board or relevant responsible body at the end of the entire operation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Waste Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the London Development Agency, through the London Waste and Recycling Board, fund additional new commercially viable waste management facilities for the processing of organic waste in East London that are fully operational by Games-time. The Commission’s view is that this needs to be achieved in a critical window to 30 June 2010 in order to have any chance of being operational for Games-time. [This recommendation builds on and takes forward earlier recommendations in the 2007 and 2008 Annual Reviews]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2010 Waste Review
That the Olympic Park Legacy Company develops an integrated waste and energy strategy for the legacy developments on the Olympic Park. This should use organic waste to derive biogas and maximise the renewable energy available to the legacy communities and facilities, with the ultimate aim of creating an exemplar zero carbon community in the Lower Lea Valley. Local employment opportunities should be considered as part of this strategy. [This recommendation builds on and takes forward earlier recommendations in the 2007 and 2008 Annual Reviews]

2010 Waste Review
That the Olympic Delivery Authority reports separately on each of the three components of the construction waste target, being the proportions and tonnage of construction waste reused, recycled, or recovered; and that this also is done for the organisations responsible for subsequent phases of the London 2012 Programme.

15.3.3. Since the March 2010 Waste review, there has been some small progress in delivering substantial new waste infrastructure in East London. The developers of the gasification plant in Raynham (now Bioessence) have been formally contracted by LWARB for investment funding into the project, and the company has resubmitted its planning application to Havering Borough Council. While there are several large-scale waste infrastructure projects that have received in principle support from LWARB, only the Raynham project has got to contract stage some two years after receiving in principle support. However, we understand from LWARB that a number of projects are due to be contracted in the next quarter. Very recently, major 2012 sponsor Coca-Cola announced it would establish a PET recycling plant to ensure it could increase the proportion of recycled PET in its own soft-drink bottles. However this plant is in Lincoln, close to Coca-Cola’s bottling plant, not East London.

15.3.4. The lack of progress on delivering waste infrastructure since 2004 is a significant shared failure for the 2012 programme and more widely amongst the market and market institutions. It is now negatively impacting on the relative sustainability of the programme’s legacy. A sustainable waste solution sited locally would enable waste from new development on the Park and from Stratford City to be dealt with in a highly sustainable manner, including the potential to incorporate water-based transport from source to sink. However, we recognise that the problem does not lie with any individual agency but that it is typical of the problems facing waste infrastructure delivery the world over.

15.3.5. We understand that there are a range of road-blocks which may be preventing new waste infrastructure emerging. Some of these include the challenge of finding and matching sites to technology and to investment within coherent timeframes. In this, we are aware that challenges in releasing public infrastructure funding has hindered efforts of waste industry players to secure the necessary matching private investment in some instances, while on the market side the challenge of meeting conditions necessary for receiving funds is also causing delays. We also recognise that appropriately siting, sizing and matching waste

infrastructure to the right technologies is highly complex and is strongly influenced by factors such as site ownership, control and management of waste streams, regulatory compliance, innovation and reliability in available technologies and economies of scale. We are of the view that our proposal for a refreshed vision for East London supported by a community of practice could greatly help to tackle these barriers, by proactively joining up effort to deliver on these strategic, high value projects.

15.3.6. Other opportunities to address waste in East London and particularly within the boundaries of the LLDC include the potential to link the mining of water from the sewer to the CCHP plant – ensuring that not just water is recycled, but energy from methane gas, and from gassifying biosolids is able to be captured. The expansion of this activity is potentially feasible as the mainline sewer carries far more effluent than is created by the Park.

15.3.7. The capacity to dramatically improve diffuse source pollution throughout the LLDC boundary and beyond could be achieved through enhanced rainwater harvesting and widespread use of greywater to irrigate parks and green spaces through expanding the non-potable network beyond the park boundaries.

15.3.8. The waste industry right across the globe knows that the most effective way to address the problem of waste is to tackle it before it becomes waste – through the design and logistics choices made by product manufacturers and retailers. The capacity for the LLDC to use its powers to eliminate unwanted packaging from retail outlets on-site and to encourage consumers to actively choose products without packaging should be explored as part of an integrated set of measures aimed to reduce total volumes of waste being generated within the LLDC boundary.

15.3.9. The Park itself is challenged by being across four different waste collection boundaries. We would strongly urge the OPLC to work with the Boroughs to find a uniform approach to waste management on the Park so that residents, businesses and visitors are in no doubt about how waste is treated and their important role in avoiding producing waste in the first place. Experience from the London 2012 test events shows that getting a waste strategy that truly drives consumers to make the right choices with their rubbish is highly challenging and requires careful honing and testing. A similar attitude to designing out waste, and to managing residual rubbish streams from residential and commercial sources will be needed if OPLC is to meet its waste targets.

15.3.10. The OPLC’s waste targets for residential waste are more cautious than we would expect at this stage. The organisation has set itself a target that 60% of residential waste is to be recycled or home composted by 2020, and zero waste to be sent directly to landfill by 2025. Home composting is contentious and somewhat brave as a strategy. Done well, it is the most sustainable strategy available for dealing with food waste as it avoids transport and processing emissions while also providing the householder with material for food growing. However, done badly, the strategy can result in significant perverse outcomes.

(rats, refuse build-up, methane emissions with a far higher global warming impact than alternative treatments). The strategy will need to be supported by a very robust approach to home composting to avoid these perverse outcomes. In addition, it is not clear how residents in homes with no outside space will effectively compost material, and so, a variant of this strategy will be required to ensure food waste is able to be separately collected.

15.3.11. There is a very powerful legacy from LOCOG’s work in designing the London 2012 Games to achieve a zero waste to landfill outcome. The work has been carefully thought through and solutions have been trialled to iron out design and supply chain challenges, including everything from waste management processes and bin design, through to packaging policies and materials selection. This learning legacy is available to the events industry more broadly and to the OPLC in particular. We commend LOCOG on this excellent work and related industry engagement.

15.3.12. The OPLC has committed to a range of minimum materials targets as part of its sustainability strategy. These include:

- 15% reduction in embodied carbon in new construction, as compared to industry baseline (to be monitored and published);
- 25% minimum recycled content of major materials (by value) within new buildings and infrastructure;
- 20% minimum, by value, of construction materials to be from a reused or recycled source;
- 100% of timber products from legal and sustainable sources supported by appropriate evidence as defined by the UK Central Point of Expertise on Timber (CPET) with full chain custody.

In addition, the organisation has committed to a 95% reduction in construction, demolition and excavation waste sent to landfill from 2012. We are pleased to see the OPLC commit to these targets including previously un-benchmarked targets like reductions in embodied carbon in new construction

15.4. Employment and skills

Overview, policy and structure

15.4.1. The London 2012 Candidature File contained a number of broad commitments to use the opportunity of the Games to improve the lives of East Londoners.

Candidature File – broad social and economic regeneration

- ‘The Games will stimulate vital economic and social regeneration in what is now a disadvantages are’ (Introduction, p.11)
- The Olympic Park will become ‘a model of social inclusion, opening up opportunities for education, cultural and skills development and jobs for people across the UK and London, but especially in the Lea Valley and surrounding areas’ (Theme 1, p.19).
It will ‘provide local people with significant improvements in health and well-being, education, skills and training, job opportunities, cultural entitlements, housing, social integration and the environment’ (Theme 1, p.23).

Candidature File – employment skills

- The ‘biggest economic legacy from the Games will be the creation of wider employment opportunities and improvements in the education, skills and knowledge of the local labour force in an area of very high unemployment’ (Theme 1, p.25).
- 7,000 FTE new jobs in the construction sector and 12,000 new jobs from legacy developments.

15.4.2. The Government and the Mayor established the London Employment & Skills Taskforce for 2012 (LEST 2012) in 2005 which, in conjunction with the London Skills and Employment Board, and in the context of the Local Employment and Training Framework (LETF) activity, forged an Action Plan to meet the employment and skills commitments as set out in the Candidature File. The LEST 2012 Action Plan set an aspiration for 70,000 additional people in work by 2012 as a result of the Games and the initiatives delivered on the back of the Games.

15.4.3. Since that time, both the ODA and LOCOG have produced and delivered plans for bolstering the employment and skills opportunities for local people and for disadvantaged or otherwise excluded groups which support the LEST 2012 objectives.

15.4.4. OPLC is now finalising its business plan which will also include employment and skills targets. It has produced its employment and skills policy including a number of initiatives it hopes will extend and build upon the successful partnerships and approaches to jobs brokerages and skills development of the ODA and LOCOG. As we have indicated, the policy recognises that the organisation will be monitored against a number of employment and inclusion goals, but it does not set overarching targets for these. We recognise that setting overarching targets is challenging as the range of contracts are diverse, we would expect the OPLC to continue to set its own lead by setting and publishing targets on a contract-by-contract basis.

Previous Commission thematic review

15.4.5. The Commission carried out its review on Employment and Skills entitled A Clear Run to Employment, in January 2009. It made 14 recommendations, all of which have been satisfactorily implemented. At the time, the Commission commended the work of LOCOG and the ODA in establishing and delivering on programmes to place people in long-term work opportunities. We also developed a definition of a sustainable job. We are pleased to see that the LEST 2012 adopted this definition:

‘A sustainable job is one that improves an individual’s life chances and benefits the community – environmentally, socially and economically.’
15.4.6. We are aware that the OPLC in developing a full employment and skills agenda, is subject to a range of different expectations from stakeholders including the Host Boroughs, local businesses, large employers and developers such as Westfield, job brokerage services, construction companies as well as the organisations founding partners (the Mayor and the Government).

15.4.7. While some stakeholders simply want a steady supply of people who are job-ready, others, in particular the Boroughs, are looking for sustained employment for local people who have previously been in long-term unemployment. We have previously acknowledged the challenges presented by defining ‘local’ when by simply moving into the Borough a person can be considered as being local. During the time-critical construction programme for the Park, the Commission considered it was acceptable that LOCOG and the ODA reached a pragmatic position on the definition of local. The OPLC, while still needing to meet critical timeframes, has a far longer development timeframe, and indeed has to take account of a broader mix of skills and jobs (from retail through to construction). In this context the OPLC has referred to ‘permanent local residents’ and we understand that it will rely upon self-assessment as a means to determine this. We understand that this is the current practice of Newham Council and that the OPLC will meet this where required. While we recognise that the OPLC has placed emphasis on specific needs groups rather than simply on a definition of ‘local’, we believe that if required in future, there is scope for the OPLC to set more stringent criteria for attracting local people into skills and employment, perhaps through evidence that a person has been on the electoral roll for a minimum of one year.

**Progress**

15.4.8. The work within the 2012 Programme to match unemployed and otherwise disadvantaged groups to work opportunities has been highly successful. LOCOG’s job’s brokerage approach has built upon and improved the system established by the ODA. The OPLC has adopted the LOCOG structure and aims to improve it still further. Yet, it has not just been the official 2012 programme that has delivered successful jobs and skills outcomes. The Retail Academy has been a stand-out success in training local people and matching them to long term job and career opportunities for the Westfield Stratford City development. The programme has matched 25 percent of jobs to long-term unemployed people and 50% were from the local area. The CEO of Westfield, commented in September 2011 on the extraordinary number of young people who sought work with Westfield but who were comparatively illiterate and innumerate.

“The most difficult thing was the number who simply do not meet the basic reading and writing criteria. They could not even fill out the forms without getting assistance. They just weren’t ready to interview.”

25 http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/standard-olympics/article-23983067-bosses-shocked-by-hundreds-of-Games-staff-who-cannot-read-or-write.do
15.4.9. The Academy trained many of this group to be job-ready. The Commission understands the Academy is funded to continue its work for a further 15-20 years. The GLA has indicated that the overarching 2012 target of providing an additional 70,000 people with jobs who would not otherwise be in employment is unlikely to be achieved, with a deficit of up to 10,000 jobs. While it is recognised that the tough economic times make meeting the target particularly difficult, we urge the GLA, the OPLC, the Host Boroughs and large employers like Westfield to continue to cooperate in generating as many opportunities as possible for disadvantaged groups preferably drawn from the local community. One of the challenges for these partners is to ensure that there is continuity of activity, particular where programme funding is due to end in 2013/14. It will be important for the GLA to continue to work with the Host Boroughs to support this activity.

15.4.10. We are aware that the government’s Tech City initiative and the Mayor’s Green Enterprise Zone provide a powerful platform for a substantial new green industry to take root within the Lower Lea Valley, and with substantial opportunities within the LLDC boundary. The challenge here is to translate strategic and spatial planning objectives into concerted action. Experience shows that ‘green zones’ do not just begin to sprout, even with policy-based support, as it is generally easier for established sectors to take up the available space. Therefore, some incentivisation or intervention is necessary to allow emerging industries to compete with already established competitors. One way to optimise further economic opportunities is to focus effort on the steps required to attract green collar industries, including whether eco-Parks and industrial symbiosis zones would provide the necessary incentive, and therefore what pre-requisites are required to enable them to be established. This practical work should be mapped out and scoped against available funds and timeframes as part of an overall approach to the valley (as per recommendation in section 2).

15.4.11. The OPLC has commissioned a labour market forecasting tool (ODA did this for construction) and the organisation will also do this for end use phases. The tool allows the organisation to feed in inputs to generate information about the type and volume and phasing of labour force for the scheme. OPLC can then pass this on to the interested providers and trainers – so that the right sorts of training is delivered at the right time. The first detailed reports from applying the tool are currently being generated.

15.4.12. The OPLC is also drawing on the state of the market report for construction for London and south east that identifies the pinnchpoints for the market. This report assists in ensuring there is labour continuity and to help to set realistic targets for later phases for employment based on a detailed understanding of labour market demands rather than simply generic floor space ratios.

15.4.13. In order to understand better the local dimension for future workforces, the OPLC commissioned an internal guide to help colleagues understand how to maximise local community benefits around procurement The guide includes what standard clauses can be used in contracts and tender processes and the types of apprenticeships that can be employed. The organisation points out that Newham, for example require people to
demonstrate that they have lived in the borough for a year, but that the target which OPLC decides upon will need to be able to be effectively monitored.

15.5. Healthy Living

Overview, policy and structure

15.5.1. Healthy living is a broad cross-cutting theme within the scope of the London 2012 programme. All Key Stakeholders have some role in delivering health outcomes before and during the Games. Some of these arise from specific Games commitments but also from statutory responsibilities, for example under health and safety legislation. However, the main legacy commitments are the responsibility of the Department of Health working through NHS Primary Care Trusts as the principal delivery bodies for public health locally. The public health function is due to be transferred to local authorities in March 2013 pending the passage of the Government’s Health and Social Care Bill. The Department of Health’s responsibilities for the wider health benefits of the Games to the UK as a whole are stated in the Olympic and Paralympic Programme Objectives signed off by the Olympic Board in March 2006. Strategic Objective 3 states: ‘To maximise the economic, social, health and environmental benefits of the Games for the UK, particularly through regeneration and sustainable development in East London’. Sub-objective 3.1.4 is held by the Government and is to ‘maximise social benefits, including in health, education and volunteering of hosting the Games’.

15.5.2. The Mayor of London is responsible for the wider health benefits of the Games to Londoners as a whole. This is also reflected in the Olympic and Paralympic Programme Objectives. Strategic Objective 3 states: ‘To maximise the economic, social, health and environmental benefits of the Games for the UK, particularly through regeneration and sustainable development in East London’. Sub-objective 3.2.4 is held by the Mayor of London and is to ‘maximise social benefits to Londoners, including in health, education and volunteering of hosting the Games’. In practice, objective 3.2.4 is being overseen by the GLA, but a significant contribution to this objective comes from the role of NHS London. The Greater London Authority Act 1999 sets out the powers of the GLA. It explicitly states that in the exercise of its powers and functions the GLA should ‘promote improvements in the health of persons in Greater London’ and also ‘contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development in the United Kingdom’ (s.30(5)).

15.5.3. In April 2010, the Mayor published the first statutory London Health Inequalities Strategy.26 Alongside this strategy, the First Steps to Delivery plan sets out priority actions to 2012 against the thirty high-level commitments from the strategy. The second of the high level commitments is to ‘motivate and enable Londoners to adopt healthier behaviours and engage in life-long learning’. The so-called ‘first step’ is to ‘ensure Olympics and Paralympics legacy plans embed sustainable action to incentivise and support healthier behaviours’. This action explicitly identifies a number of related strategies, including those of partners, such as NHS Go London and Inclusive and Active 2.

26 www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/mayor/publications/health/health-inequalities-strategy
Previous Commission thematic review

15.5.4. In April 2009, the Chair of the Commission presented the findings from the 2008 Annual Review to the London Health Commission. In September 2009, the two Commissions jointly hosted a round table to discuss the desired health legacy from hosting the Games in London in 2012. Following this, in March 2011, the Commission published *Fit for Purpose? A Review of Inclusion and Healthy Living across the London 2012 Programme.*27 The review focused on both healthy living and inclusion across the main phases of the Games. One of the key aims of this review was to explore the finding from the Commission’s 2009 Annual Review that there is not a joined up approach to the Healthy Living strand of the London 2012 Sustainability Policy. In addition, the review sought to assess the activity of Key Stakeholders and related bodies to maximise the health and inclusion opportunities arising from the Games, in particular to identify the role of London 2012 in preventing ill health and supporting healthy lifestyles. Three recommendations of the Inclusion and Healthy Living Review as they relate to health living specifically are shown in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Commission’s recommendations on healthy living from the 2011 thematic review</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>From the Annual Review 2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That there is greater co-ordination of the healthy living agenda across Key Stakeholders, through existing groups, or possibly by establishing a Health Legacy board as part of the legacy governance structure. (This is the responsibility of GOE and the GLA.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the London 2012 Sustainability Group ensures that all healthy living commitments in the London 2012 Sustainability Plan are being actively monitored and progressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That LOCOG, the British Olympic Association and the British Paralympic Association maximise the legacy of the Get Set programme and find partners to achieve this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.5.5. The review found that the promotion of sport and physical activity was the key element in delivering the commitments around healthy living. Inclusive and Active 2, a programme for disabled sport driven by the Mayor, was highlighted for specific praise. This programme is implemented in London but not nationally. The Commission suggested that Sport England replicate its principles in future programmes. More specifically the Commission suggested that all publicly funded programmes aimed at increasing sports participation and physical activity include a requirement for a proportion of the cohort to include previously inactive people.

15.5.6. The review referred to the pre-Bid Health Impact Assessment led by NHS London with London 2012 in 2004.28 The HIA reviewed the literature and available evidence surrounding the link between hosting a Games and increased participation in physical activity and sport by the host population. In summary, the literature supported the contention that major sporting events such as the Olympic Games provide a powerful platform to promote and positively influence lifestyle, behaviour and culture. However, a significant finding was that

---

the strength of such messages and their ability to influence and secure healthier living during the Olympics are dependent upon the actions taken by host nations to promote and nurture such benefit, together with a more responsible attitude to international sponsorship.

15.5.7. The Commission’s review emphasised that an important legacy for healthy living and physical activity is to the ability to measure success. The health roundtable held in September 2009 adopted the following action: ‘Approach a research body to do some baseline research on the 5 boroughs and pan London on current health, well-being and physical activity – incorporating wider determinants of health such as employment, housing and education’. The review highlighted the necessity for baseline research to be undertaken in order to be able to evaluate the wider impact of hosting the Games on healthy living. We now understand London NHS has commissioned University College London to undertake an evaluation of the NHS London Healthy Living Programme to determine what initiatives made a difference to health outcomes.

**Legacy findings**

15.5.8. With the election of a new Government in May 2010, some of the plans and policies of the previous government have been superseded. Together with this, the Spending Review 2010 has had major implications for the funding of programmes throughout the delivery structures of the health system. As recognised in the 2011 thematic review of inclusion and healthy living, the new Government’s policies and priorities have the potential to materially affect the sustainability context of the London 2012 Games, particularly as regards legacy. This is further compounded by the proposed changes in the institutional architecture of the NHS in England and the transfer of public health functions to local authorities in March 2013. However, our concerns are lessened somewhat by the fact that a longer time has been given to this proposed reorganisation than was originally planned (when it was originally proposed that the reorganisation take effect in 2012).

15.5.9. The previous government’s approach to healthy living was based around a national plan and a 2 million commitment to increase physical activity via 1 million people doing more sport and 1 million people being more active. The current approach to healthy living changes the emphasis to local initiatives linked to a results-based funding strategy for sports participation. There is now limited detailed monitoring of the Government’s 2012 Healthy Living legacy objectives nationally. Although, we have been advised that data on baseline health and life expectancy for East London has been collected via the Place Survey in 2008. Further that a boost to the Taking Part Survey is currently being carried out in East London. This boost survey will provide a pre-event measure of participation in sport and physical activity as well as more data on health for East London. This partially allays our concerns about monitoring.

15.5.10. The Department of Health (DH) contribution to Sport and Physical Activity Legacy includes a national ambition for physical activity (including sport) of: *A year on year increase in the number of adults doing 150 minutes of exercise per week and a similar reduction in those who are ‘inactive’.*
Specific initiatives include:

- **School Games**: £7m per annum over four years (until March 2015) to support competitive sport for all youngsters through the School Games – with the aim of focussing on getting the least active to play sport and strong inclusion of disabled children and young people. Over 11,000 schools, almost 50% of all schools in England are already signed up to take part in the School Games. The games involve competitions within schools, between schools, at local authority, county level and a national competition. This year the national competition will take place in the Olympic Park and feature over 30,000 children.

- **Change4Life Sports Clubs** are a new and innovative type of club to appeal to children and young people who have not previously engaged with traditional sports provision in schools and clubs, and will therefore reach those who are least active. By 2015, over 300,000 primary and secondary school children will have participated in Change4Life Clubs, engaging them in school sport and providing a stepping-stone into lifelong participation. (DH investment of £8.4m across 2011/12 to 2014/15) Change4Life has developed plans for a Games4Life campaign in summer 2012 which will include a nationwide TV campaign that will encourage the public to ‘join in’ with fun and games aimed to get them more physically active. The campaign will include direct communication, including tools and resources, to over half a million Change4Life families. Campaign material will also be distributed to 4,500 primary schools through Change4Life Sports Clubs. There will also be a range of digital support, tools and engagement through the C4L website, Facebook, Twitter and You Tube all aimed harnessing the excitement generated by the Games to get people more active.

- **NHS Challenge** aims to get 2,012 more staff in each PCT area to more active by the London 2012 Olympics. This will equate to over 300,000 NHS staff more active and has been successful in securing the London 2012 Inspire Mark.

- **The Civil Service Physical Activity Challenge** for 515,000 headcount staff. Twelve Government Departments have already signed up with more to follow. The Civil Service Sports Council has pledged to support the Challenge, for example by developing offers for non-members.

- **Public Health Responsibility Deal**: The Department has created a Physical Activity Network as part of the Public Health Responsibility Deal, which has signed up over 180 official partners, from business the public sector and the third sector pledging to take action to encourage and assist people to become more physically active. For example, the Co-operative (working with the Activate Sport charity) has pledged to reach 20,000 young people across 34 counties by doubling the number of sports camps they provide by 2012, giving away thousands of free places to disadvantaged youngsters. During 2012, the Network will expand further and will seek to develop further high impact pledges (including maximising the potential offered by hosting the Olympics and Paralympics to inspire people of all ages to get more active).

- **UK CMOs’ Guidelines**: For the first time the four home country Chief Medical Officers have provided physical activity guidelines for early years, older people and sedentary
behaviour as part of a review of their Chief Medical Officers’ existing recommendations on the levels of exercise required to achieve general health benefits. These UK-wide guidelines build upon the latest evidence and follow a life-course approach. Their launch in July has created the opportunity for a renewed focus on the benefits of physical activity and sport for health in the run up to 2012.

- **Walking for Health:** Working with Natural England, DH has invited tenders from interested organisations to host Walking for Health and therefore secure the future of this important national programme of volunteer-led health walks. The programme attracts 2.5 million walker attendances per year across 650 schemes.

- **Disability Legacy:** DH has contributed to the Government’s 2012 Legacy for Disabled People, which was published in April. This sets out specific initiatives aimed at increasing physical activity among disabled people. These include:
  - An “Easyread” version of the Let’s Get Moving patient pack to support those with learning disabilities to become more physically active.
  - DH has provided funding to the English Federation of Disability Sport in 2010/11 to develop a robust business model to effectively support the health and social care sector to engage disabled people in health related physical activity.

15.5.11. The NHS focus on the preparation for the Games themselves, in particular health and medical services at Games time, emergency preparedness, and related public health measures will have some form of legacy in its own right. This includes NHS services for overseas visitors, through signposting, protocols for charging non-residents, and dissemination of information through Visit Britain, Visit London and foreign embassies. The NHS conducted a ‘Rapid Health Impact Assessment’ of a series of its policies: responsible serving of alcohol, healthy food, smoke free environments, healthy event management (e.g. shade requirements) and sanitary and hygiene measures. NHS London has produced guidance for live sites and other cultural events around healthy event management and applicable standards for local government enforcement. This work will be included in the World Health Organisation mass gatherings guidance in future as a direct legacy of the planning in London. NHS London is funding training for volunteers and London Ambassadors in emergency CPR/life support. The London Deanery is running an initiative to support medical trainees to volunteer with over 35 community organisations as part of the legacy of the Games.

15.5.12. The Commission’s view is that the healthy living legacy programme is somewhat problematic although an improved picture from when we published our Health and Inclusion Review. NHS London first published its strategy to improve participation in physical activity in 2009. It has since been updated in line with changing policy and is supporting the delivery of a range of pan London programmes including Your Personal Best (a national campaign for people with long term conditions and sponsored by Glaxo Smith Klein), My Best Move (to train GPs in every borough to make physical activity a part of every patient consultation), the NHS Challenge (to promote healthy lifestyles and workplace health for NHS staff), Brain Train (to support people with mental health problems to participate in physical activity), and the joint sponsorship of Inclusive
and Active along with the Mayor. NHS London has also prepared a compendium of approximately 80 case studies.\(^{29}\) The London 2012 ‘Get Set’ Education programme has been successful in bringing the Olympic and Paralympic values to over 2 million young children in the UK. Sponsors, such as General Electric, are delivering a range of ‘activation programmes’. There is also active travel programmes, and programmes with sports governing bodies. This range of programmes is impressive and NHS London has done much to ensure that these are embedded locally in advance of the reorganisation in March 2013. However, as highlighted in the Inclusion and Healthy Living Review, there are significant challenges relating to associating increased physical activity and sports participation with positive outcomes relating to obesity and healthy living more broadly. The Commission notes that these challenges were unambiguously identified in the 2004 Health Impact Assessment of the Games.

15.5.13. NHS London has stated that it will position and sustain health legacy work through the proposed Health and Wellbeing Boards and also potentially via the Mayor of London’s Health Improvement Board. The Health and Wellbeing Boards will be established following the reforms to the NHS in the Health and Social Care Bill. Local “active celebrations” strategy to add value from the Olympics. NHS London have informed the Commission that they will activate their final campaign on healthy living legacy in the three months leading up to the Games (with targets relating to minutes of physical activity, money saved, lives saved by 2016).

15.5.14. The Commission remains concerned that despite the excellent preparatory work the NHS is doing to embed healthy living locally, effective healthy living legacy policy may be being constrained due the altered focus on policy priorities. As such, there is a risk that the wider healthy living legacy may drop off the strategic agenda. Thematic attention to healthy living as part of the 2012 programme is now primarily delivered through the Supporting Healthy Living theme under the Convergence Action Plan which is being embedded in the wider and longer-term regeneration of East London with the support of the ELLG, the boroughs and the PCTs. This is largely appropriate, although we note that the Mayor’s Health Improvement Board will be the only pan-London Health focussed strategic body, once the reorganisation of the NHS takes full effect in March 2013. We understand that in this context and as part of NHS London’s discussion with the Mayor’s Health Improvement Board, it intends to propose to the HIB at its Autumn meeting that it consider how the HIB might play a longer term role with respect to healthy living and drawing on some of the London 2012 lessons, in particular in relation to Healthy Schools and links to the Get Set Programme. As the HIB has a pan-London scope, health legacy issues would need to be considered in a pan-London context for them to be incorporated into the scope of the HIB. We would urge the HIB and NHS London to work together on this challenge, and while we note that the policy landscape has evolved, we refer stakeholders to our earlier recommendation in this regard:

\textit{That there is greater co-ordination of the healthy living agenda across Key Stakeholders, through existing groups, or possibly by establishing a}
15.5.15. The legacy of the Government’s reforms to sports and physical activity funding has been highlighted widely by stakeholders and in the press as a real challenge to achieving the uplift in sports participation required for the government to meet its bid commitment to inspire a new generation of young people to greater sporting activity.

15.5.16. The challenge for participation at school and in the wider community is amplified by the most recent results of the Active People Survey which shows that there is a drop in active participation in people aged 16-19 since London won the right to host the Olympic and Paralympic Games. The government has acknowledged that these figures are disappointing. Adult participation has increased since 2005/06 (adult 3x30 minutes sports participation was 15.5% in 2005/06 and grew to 16.3% in 2010/11) But 16-19 participation has declined over the same period (from around 33% to 32% over the same period).

15.5.17. The Government has recently launched its Community Sports Strategy which commits £1bn over five years from 2012 to help people and communities across the country create a sporting habit for life, investing in organisations and projects that will:

- Help more people have a sporting habit for life
- Create more opportunities for young people to play sport
- Nurture and develop talent
- Provide the right facilities in the right places
- Support local authorities and unlock local funding
- Ensure real opportunities for communities

15.5.18. The strategy includes National Governing Body (NGB) 2013-17 funding with a tough regime of payment by results, underpinned by Facilities investment, local investment and school Games and school investment with new programmes such as satellite clubs on school sites. This is in part to counter the problem of resources being allocated to governing bodies which do not in turn improve the uptake of sporting participation in their particular sport. There are a range of attendant measures to support the programme. The School Games programme (mentioned previously) where approximately 50% of schools have signed up to take part in a competition will culminate in the finals being held in the Olympic Park and other 2012 venues between 6-9 May 2012. The Government’s Places People Play Programme (delivered by Sport England) continues, with its remit to improve the sporting and recreational infrastructure across the country.

15.5.19. The Government’s new community sports strategy is the third iteration of sports and active living programmes and initiatives since London won the right to host the Games. Under the current strategy, whilst funding to school sport has declined, the resources
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available to community sport have remained strong and increased in recent years. However sports participation rates have shown slow growth overall, and are particularly challenging in the young peoples’ segment. In this context it is too early to form a view about the extent to which performance-based funding will improve outcomes over the longer term. We have been concerned that the regime could negatively impact on funding of community clubs which are hosted by schools, however, we have been advised that this programme will not negatively impact on school sports clubs. We strongly urge the 2012 Key Stakeholders to maintain a clear focus in achieving bid commitments over the remainder of 2012 and for the ensuing years to 2017.

15.5.20. It would be remiss not to reflect positively on the Mayor’s sports programme which is both innovative and tackling hard to reach young people in London. The long term impact of this approach is yet to be felt but the Commission commends the Mayor for tackling this priority.

15.5.21. The OPLC has a range of policies which address sport and healthy living, equalities and inclusion and inclusive design, all of which are supported by an extensive engagement and communications approach. The Sport and Healthy Living Policy commits the OPLC
to ensuring minimum levels of community access to venues its controls within the Park, and to a range of initiatives to promote healthy active living throughout the Park. We have previously provided comment on this policy and are comfortable with the community access targets and the strategic objectives contained within. Through its Community and Business Engagement strategy, the organisation has embarked on an extensive set of initiatives to reach a range of different community cohorts. For example, it has launched a youth multi-media project which uses radio as a means to engage young people and provide them with a voice as well as multi-media skills. The organisation has established a Legacy Youth Panel which it consults regularly and which runs its own blog from the OPLC website. The Equality and Inclusion Policy and the Inclusive Design Policy both work to ensure that the OPLC is actively addressing disadvantage and providing for inclusive environments in all that the organisation does. Drawing strongly on the SRF and the principle of convergence, the E&I policy includes objectives like: ‘Create an accessible and inspiring new place which embeds the highest standards of inclusive design as the Park is transformed and begins to open’. As we have already noted, we are impressed with the outcomes of the competitive dialogue process in negotiating employment related outcomes from contracts on the Park to date, and we are also comfortable that the OPLC has the right measures in place to ensure its Inclusive Design approach is supported and implemented appropriately (for example continuation of the Built Environment Access Panel).

15.5.22. The work of British Waterways with the Environment Agency, Thames Water, Natural England and the Lea Valley Regional Park Authority to improve the waterways themselves and the abutting riparian zones as well as the broader environment along the banks of the Lea will continue to improve people’s connectivity to nature. The health and wellbeing benefits which derive from accessing nature is one of the key underpinnings of Green Infrastructure and is further underscored by the ‘Sowing the Seeds’ research report which highlights the value of access to nature for children. The OPLC has also recognised the important role that nature plays in wellbeing through the support it is providing to the Good Gym programme which signs up members to do running routes that incorporate a personal visit to an isolated person, ensuring there are multiple benefits to the joiner and the person who is visited.

15.5.23. The ODA’s record in health and safety sets the bar very high for future major construction projects, but of course has its own human legacy in deaths and accidents avoided. We commend the ODA for embedding health and safety outcomes into the construction programme and for achieving such an exemplary health and safety record.
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Appendix 1 – Method

1. Methodology of review

The fieldwork was carried out during summer/autumn 2011. This review was led by Emma Synnott with support from Gary Cox and Jonathan Turner.

Interviews

We carried out a series of interviews with staff involved in the delivery of environmental, social and economic sustainability objectives covering:

- The programmes in place
- The systems designed to deliver them
- Outcomes to date
- Issues with scalability and delivery challenges
- The sustainability of outcomes
- The potential impact of the operating environment, particularly the economic downturn

We interviewed the following people:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baroness Margaret Ford</td>
<td>OPLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Altman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Firth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niall McNevin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosannah Laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Brickell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Eyres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Tudor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Naish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elenor Fawcett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive Little</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowmya Parthasarathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Stonebridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Austen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Frost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Raymond</td>
<td>COFELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Simmons</td>
<td>Best Foot Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Deighton</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Hunt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Abda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Pollard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Stubbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Hubbard</td>
<td>LWARB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Dessent</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Jacobs</td>
<td>GLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neale Coleman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Fletcher-Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellham Salter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hawthorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Reeves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Walters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deirdre McGonagall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhiannon Lewis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Feehily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndon Fothergill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Broker</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Bucknall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moira Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Sowrey</td>
<td>DEFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Hone</td>
<td>ODA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Knight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Taylor</td>
<td>Host Borough Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa O’Riordan</td>
<td>British Olympic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Rutter</td>
<td>British Waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui Stearn</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob McCarthy</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Newman</td>
<td>Thames Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Barnes</td>
<td>Triathlon Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Burton</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciara O’Rielly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Thompson</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Shaw</td>
<td>NHS London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Ross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun Dawson</td>
<td>Lea Valley Regional Park Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Andrew Mawson</td>
<td>President, Bromley–by-Bow Centre, Chair All Party Parliamentary Group for East London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSDC Commissioners</td>
<td>London Sustainable Development Commission – October meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2 – Status of recommendations from previous reviews relating to legacy

### 2007 Governance Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Ensure that shortage of information on legacy use of facilities does not preclude the business case for sustainable options by working with a range of options and scenarios for whole life cost to enable value judgements to be made when faced with shortage of information. Ensure that the value engineering process does not compromise the SD standards established for the project.</td>
<td>The overall ethos of the ODA programme has been to design and build with a focus on legacy. However, whole life costing has not fully been applied to ODA procurement, due to the lack of knowledge of legacy use and focus on programme and budget to 2012. Value engineering has led to examples of positive environmental impacts where the embodied energy in materials has been reduced and to date we have not seen evidence of value engineering compromising the published sustainability standards. The big build is now complete and this is still the case. Transformation is now the responsibility of the OPLC, so the risk of the transformation and legacy masterplans being disconnected, particularly for the landscape and public realm, is now an internal matter for the OPLC and lessened as a result. The Commission continues to monitor the OPLC plans for transformation and legacy and has addressed this within a new recommendation in this report. <strong>Closed (recommendations within this report take precedence)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2 – Status of recommendations from previous reviews relating to legacy

Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 | Legacy Review | March 2012
### 2008 Design Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7   | LDA (Now OPLC)   | That the LDA ensures that the site and venues are future-proofed and retain sufficient flexibility to adapt to new opportunities and satisfy longer term policy requirements such as the Mayor of London’s Climate Change Action Plan and draft Climate Change Adaptation Strategy | The OPLC has initiated work to review venues in operation to identify further carbon reduction and other sustainability measures, which may be able to be implemented.  
**Progress Made** |
| 9   | LDA (Now OPLC)   | That the LMF sustainability criteria drive design. In order to meet the Mayor of London’s climate change target of a 60% reduction by 2025, the development is likely to need to be zero carbon in use and have very low embodied CO₂ compared to a business as usual design, in addition to supporting a shift to lower carbon transport options, and enabling a reduction in the impact of food and consumption. | The LCS commits to meet zero carbon homes in advance of the statutory requirements.  
**Progress Made** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LDA (Now OPLC)</td>
<td>That the findings of the London 2012 Carbon Footprinting and Carbon Management Strategy are applied to LDA’s design processes to inform the areas needing action to reduce their carbon footprint.</td>
<td>OPLC is engaging in a range of carbon reduction and modelling activities and have set a target to reduce embodied carbon by 15%. <strong>Progress Made</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LDA (Now OPLC)</td>
<td>That LDA sets out clear policy going forward, linked to an understanding of the rate of change of what will be the norm in development schemes when projecting forward to 2012, 2020 and 2050, particularly when considering the rate of change in approaches to addressing sustainability, through technological advances and behavioural change, over the past 5-10 years. This needs to include a commitment to continuous improvement of the sustainability performance of the development, as it will occur over a long period of time.</td>
<td>OPLC has set out a vision to 2030 and has committed to monitoring progress against benchmarks and to review targets over time. Some targets are beyond statutory requirements. <strong>Progress Made</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LDA (Now OPLC)</td>
<td>That the LDA ensures the legacy builds on the accessibility of the Games, with its aim to be the most accessible Games.</td>
<td>The OPLC has produced an inclusive design policy and is taking forward the ODA’s Built Environment Access Panel (BEAP) which will assist with its implementation. <strong>Progress Made</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>That there is clear integration of sustainability objectives into the early design stages for the remaining developments and ongoing projects of all the Key Stakeholders. This is in order to prevent the need to alter designs to build in sustainability criteria or retrofit at a later stage as this may lead to increased cost and consumption of resources.</td>
<td>This recommendation has been implemented by the ODA and by LOCOG. <strong>Complete</strong> Projects that weren’t part of the original programme, for example the Orbit, were late to apply sustainability to their designs but have been subsequently required to meet the programme standards. The OLPC has begun to apply it. There were initial concerns over their level of engagement with transformation issues when these were being managed by the ODA but these are being resolved now that the OPLC is responsible for transformation. <strong>Progress Made</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ODA LOCOG LDA</td>
<td>That sustainability specialists are involved in the evaluation of design-related tenders to ensure that the relevant issues are considered at an early stage.</td>
<td>Sustainability was a criterion for ODA design and the sustainability team were engaged with or providing guidance to teams for the final design processes. <strong>Complete</strong> LOCOG incorporated sustainability requirements in the tender for their architects, engineering services and planning consultants to ensure they do this. Five members of the LOCOG Sustainability Team are embedded in the Venues Team to ensure that sustainability is integrated into design and operation of venues. They have also developed a Venues Sustainability Strategy; Health, Safety and Sustainability Standard; and Sustainable Design Requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCOG have developing the LOCOG Overlay and Access File (LOAF) for Inclusive Design.

**Complete**

This did not appear to be the case for the Orbit but this has now had sustainability criteria applied to it.

The OPLC intend to have specialist sustainability expertise within the design/commission process, both in its structuring and evaluation. They appointed sustainability consultants to help produce a new sustainability strategy and still need to ensure that sustainability is factored into all design and that sufficient resources are in place to enable this to be implemented.

**Progress Made**

### 2008 Annual Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>The GLA and Government should ensure that the Olympic Park Legacy Company currently under development for legacy has the long term sustainable development of the Olympic Park enshrined in its objectives, governance, management capacity, structures, funding and business plan, and will ensure integration with wider Lower Lea Valley initiatives.</td>
<td>The OPLC intend to have specialist sustainability expertise integrated within the organisations and its processes. They appointed sustainability consultants to help produce a new sustainability strategy and still need to ensure that sustainability is factored into all design and that sufficient resources are in place to enable this to be implemented. A new recommendation has been made in this report to address these issues directly. <strong>Closed (recommendations within this report take precedence)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The LDA [now OPLC] should assess the resources required to embed sustainability into the Legacy Masterplan Framework and to act as an effective client. These resources should be deployed as permanent staff at a senior level where possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9 | OPLC | The OPLC intended to have specialist sustainability expertise within the design/commission process, both in its structuring and evaluation. They had stated an intent to appoint a new Head of Sustainability, reporting to the Director of Planning and Sustainability but so far have only recruited a more junior project management position. An environmental sustainability strategy has been produced, along with socio-economic strategies. Sustainability needs to be factored into all designs and contracts and sufficient resources will need to be in place at the right time to enable this to happen. A new recommendation has been made in this report to address these issues directly.  
**Closed (recommendations within this report take precedence)** |
| 13 | LOCOG OPLC | Previous uncertainties over the funding of key skills and employment projects that will support London 2012 programme objectives on local employment and a diverse workforce have been resolved and good progress has been made with securing opportunities for local people to secure Games-time employment.  
The OPLC has produced its employment and skills policy including a number of initiatives it hopes will extend and build upon the successful partnerships and approaches to jobs brokerages and skills development of the ODA and LOCOG. The policy recognises that the organisation will be monitored against a number of employment and inclusion goals, but it does not set overarching targets for these. We recognise that setting overarching targets is challenging as the range of contracts are diverse, we would expect the OPLC to continue to set its own lead by setting and publishing targets on a contract-by-contract basis.  
**Progress Made** |
In further developing the programme of leisure, culture and visitor management, the GLA, GOE and LDA [now OPLC] should consider use of the experience and intellectual property generated by LOCOG.

To date there is only ad-hoc and informal evidence of knowledge transfer. The main LOCOG knowledge transfer programme is geared to providing knowledge to the IOC and future Host Cities. We are concerned that without a clear programme for knowledge transfer within the UK, and with LOCOG disappearing shortly after the Games, there is a risk that this knowledge will be lost. The Commission is aware that OPLC has been engaging with LOCOG bilaterally on knowledge sharing.

**Progress Made**

---

**Carbon Review:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>London 2012 Sustainability Group</td>
<td>The GLA and The reference footprint should be recalculated and published on a regular basis. Assumptions should be explicitly stated to ensure openness and transparency.</td>
<td>The London 2012 Sustainability Plan states that London 2012 will provide an update of the footprint in the final pre-Games report and post-Games reports. The recommendations in the carbon footprint publication indicate that the reference footprint should be recalculated and published annually. London 2012 have indicated that they do not intend to follow this recommendation, however, the footprint is to be updated with as more accurate information is obtained and published in the pre-Games report and post-Games reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress Made**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All CSL</th>
<th>Each individual Key Stakeholder should be responsible for reducing or avoiding emissions within their area of responsibility. The Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 has a responsibility to assure this activity</th>
<th>The ODA and LOCOG have demonstrated plans or initiatives to tackle their carbon footprints where this is still possible. The ODA set targets for embodied carbon in their temporary venues (Basketball Arena, Shooting venue). LOCOG is hiring equipment wherever possible to avoid the need for purchasing new items. They have initiatives around energy use but we the Commission is concerned that there is not a clear plan and has recommended one is produced as soon as possible. The GLA (City Ops) are investigating ways of calculating and addressing the carbon emissions associated with their plans. It is not clear how this was applied to the Orbit. The OPLC is developing its sustainability plans for legacy including targets for carbon reduction. <strong>Progress Made</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>All CSL</td>
<td>The marginal carbon cost of decisions should be factored into operational decision making, taking into account life-cycle carbon impacts where possible and in a transparent and open manner.</td>
<td>The carbon emissions associated with most projects are being considered and decisions are being taken that will reduce their carbon emissions. At times this will be due to specific consideration of carbon, at other times it will be associated with cost reduction and value engineering, or optimisation of technology and transport. Examples include low carbon concrete, hiring equipment to prevent the need for new items to be produced and the use of various biofuels. Plans are developing for this to be taken into account with City Operations. This was not demonstrably the case with the design of the Orbit. <strong>Progress Made</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Waste and Resource Management Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LDA</td>
<td>That the London Development Agency, through the London Waste and Recycling Board, fund additional new commercially viable waste management facilities for the processing of organic waste in East London that are fully operational by Games-time. The Commission’s view is that this needs to be achieved in a critical window to 30 June 2010 in order to have any chance of being operational for Games-time. [This recommendation builds on and takes forward earlier recommendations in the 2007 and 2008 Annual Reviews]</td>
<td>This has not happened. LWARB has announced (in August and November 2010) that a series of projects are progressing and will be worked into full business cases. The first projects being funded including two AD plants. However, these are extremely unlikely to be operational by Games-time. Whilst the Companies and organisations involved have previously stated that they could be operational by Games-time, it is not likely that the plants could be fully tested and ready to take Games-time waste. We recognise that the failure to achieve this recommendation is shared across the industry including private and public sector organisations. Not Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>London 2012 Sustainability Group All</td>
<td>That the London 2012 Sustainability Group set out how the management of waste and resources in the post-Games bump-out/breakdown phase and subsequent transformation phase will be co-ordinated and where responsibility will lie.</td>
<td>The Commission has observed progress being made around roles and responsibilities for transformation, including dealing with waste. There is an intention to ensure that as much material can be reused or recycled as possible and comprehensive asset registers are being developed. Where possible. This is taking a lot of material out of the waste stream. They will not have a reuse target but this is driving materials being reused. The Commission has accepted that a specific reuse target is not necessary for LOCOG.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This encompasses the operations of City Operations, HMG, LOCOG and the ODA and how they will all maximise reuse of materials.

This needs to:
(i) include how responsibility for the end use of temporary materials, demolition and construction materials will be coordinated;
(ii) have as its main objective the sale and reuse of these materials, including setting a specific target for reuse, then the recycling and recovery of materials, according to the optimal option in carbon terms for the specific item or material;
(iii) take reasonable endeavours to reuse or recycle at least 90 per cent, by weight, of the material arising from the installation and deconstruction of temporary venues, equipment and overlay;
(iv) be set out as soon as possible in order to be able to influence decisions relating to all operational aspects,

OPLC’s draft sustainability strategy does not at this stage include a waste reuse target. However, there is still no specific target for reuse as we have recommended. Without a reuse target there is a significant risk that materials which could be reused will be recycled or downcycled instead, which is likely to have a higher environmental impact.

LOCOG are very focussed on hiring V+I and equipment and having buy back agreements. It has committed to ODA construction standards for transformation but this does not include a separate waste reuse target. The Commission has advised OPLC to strengthen this component. Without a reuse target there is a serious risk that reuse opportunities will be lost.

Progress Made
including logistics, transport, regulatory compliance, security, and health and safety;

(v) report on progress and present a final report to the Olympic Board or relevant responsible body at the end of the entire operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>OPLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the Olympic Park Legacy Company develops an integrated waste and energy strategy for the legacy developments on the Olympic Park. This should use organic waste to derive biogas and maximise the renewable energy available to the legacy communities and facilities, with the ultimate aim of creating an exemplar zero carbon community in the Lower Lea Valley. Local employment opportunities should be considered as part of this strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[This recommendation builds on and takes forward earlier recommendations in the 2007 and 2008 Annual Reviews] |

The OPLC is investigating waste and energy options to assess the opportunities and the challenges involved. A draft environmental sustainability strategy has been produced by the OPLC which references this sort of opportunity.

**Progress Made**
### Food Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OPLC GLA</td>
<td>The OPLC should develop detailed design guidance for developers on how to incorporate food growing into their development plots, along the lines of the guidance developed for the South East False Creek in Vancouver, site of the 2010 Winter Games Athlete’s Village. This could be applied more widely to other developments in London by the GLA.</td>
<td>This is planned but no detail has come forward yet. <strong>No Evidence Yet</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OPLC</td>
<td>Future development in the Olympic Park, led by the OPLC, should follow the example of the Athletes Village for which there is a draft Food Strategy that can be implemented over time as the homes are occupied and if the community demonstrates an interest in growing their own food. This would ensure that the development is futureproofed and can enable food growing to be ‘retrofitted’. This should also include facilities to make it easy for residents and businesses to access healthy and sustainable food.</td>
<td>This is planned but no detail has come forward yet. <strong>No Evidence Yet</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2009 Annual Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>London 2012 Sustainability Group</td>
<td>That the London 2012 Sustainability Group establish a timely, clear, co-ordinated, funded, independent work programme to capture sustainability lessons learned and to set new standards of sustainability in the sectors identified by the senior executives in January 2009.</td>
<td>The ODA has now launched its learning legacy, which will include information about how others can follow their lead, including cutting construction-related carbon emissions. The UKGBC is rolling out a programme of communication to the industry. LOCOG is developing knowledge management plans, although this is more around knowledge transfer to the IOC. LOCOG is also promoting the uptake of BS8901. These initiatives form the basis for an overall programme to disseminate lessons learnt and set new standards of sustainability by getting others to follow. Some plans are being discussed and taken forward by Government and industry associations to make this happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td>That LOCOG continue to explore opportunities with the legacy owners and the sport community to ensure the optimum long term benefit is achieved in lease/buy decisions.</td>
<td>LOCOG was clear that they will lease items wherever possible but where a potential legacy owner that will pay the premium for buying products is identified then they will do this. LOCOG has an asset disposal strategy which looks to recoup revenue from the disposal of assets. Some assets have been earmarked for donation. However, those assets which are earmarked to be sold will be sold through a variety of means post-games. LOCOG has determined that it will not be offering the OPLC or any other venue owners, assets at no cost. The Commission understands that negotiations are underway between the OPLC and LOCOG to determine what legacy the OPLC will purchase and what, of LOCOG overlay in the Park will be removed and sold to other customers. One obvious asset which would benefit the OPLC is LOCOG’s bin solution. The Commission is keen to ensure that sustainability outcomes are considered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
within the context of asset transfer and that where possible, appropriate sponsorship opportunities are explored by potential purchasers to offset these costs.

**Significant Risk**

| 10 | OPLC | That the OPLC work with partners in the local community to ensure the Olympic Park is able to deliver zero carbon energy by 2016.  
[This recommendation builds on and takes forward earlier recommendations in the 2007 and 2008 Annual Reviews] | The OPLC is investigating waste and energy options to assess the opportunities and the challenges involved. A draft environmental sustainability strategy has been produced by the OPLC which references this sort of opportunity.  
**Progress Made** |

| 12 | GOE GLA | That there is greater co-ordination of the health agenda across Key Stakeholders, through existing groups, or possibly by establishing a Health Legacy board as part of the legacy governance structure. | In the Commission’s review of Inclusion and Healthy Living, we acknowledged the establishment of the Olympic and Paralympic Health Programme Board and the Physical Activity Programme Board. Both of these have the potential to encourage greater coordination of activities on the ground and to consider health legacy issues. The Commission is still not seeing the rapid progress on this recommendation that is needed despite restating the recommendation in that report and progress is still looked for.  
**Significant Risk** |
### Biodiversity Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | ODA OPLC       | That the ODA review existing procedures and controls to ensure they are suitable for managing the habitats during Park Operations and Transformation. This needs to ensure that the habitats and species present on the park are safeguarded, protected and enhanced and that the biodiversity of the park is monitored during these phases. | The ODA developed a landscape maintenance plan to cover the management of habitats in the Park Operations and Transformation phases. This includes managing the biodiversity of the habitats. Transformation has been handed to the OPLC who need to confirm their plans.  
**Progress Made** |
| 2   | OPLC           | That the body or bodies responsible for the Olympic Park in legacy set out and implement clear plans for how the habitat will be maintained, managed and monitored to ensure that a minimum of 45 ha of SINC of at least Borough Grade 1 standard develops within the Olympic Park. | The Transformation Planning Application shows how the majority of this habitat will be provided, with the remainder dependant on a further application covering other areas such as the stadium island, which will come forward when the stadium use is clearer. The Commission is concerned that proposals to have a larger stadium in legacy will mean that this new habitat may not come forward. If this is the case further areas of BAP habitat will need to be created elsewhere in the park. In addition there are some concerns around how certain habitats in the north of the park will be impacted by new legacy proposals. The OPLC has committed to providing the requisite habitat and the Commission looks forward to seeing detailed plans for how this will be delivered.  
The ODA produced a document “Towards a 10 year management plan” which sets out how the site can be managed, including the ecological elements of the Park. The OPLC incorporated key elements of this and the Biodiversity Action Plan when procuring an |
estates and facilities management contractor in 2011. The level of resources available for the long term habitat management will be critical to ensuring that the BAP habitats are able to mature and achieve the appropriate SINC status.

### Progress Made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ODA LOCOG GLA GOE OPLC</td>
<td>Re-iteration of recommendation 12 from the 2009 Annual Review That there is greater co-ordination of the healthy living agenda across Key Stakeholders, through existing groups, or possibly by establishing a Health Legacy board as part of the legacy governance structure. (This is the responsibility of GOE and the GLA.)</td>
<td>The Commission has acknowledged the establishment of the Olympic and Paralympic Health Programme Board and the Physical Activity Programme Board. Both of these have the potential to encourage greater coordination of activities on the ground and to consider health legacy issues. The Commission is still not seeing the rapid progress on this recommendation that is needed despite restating the recommendation in the review of Inclusion and Healthy Living and progress is still looked for. <strong>Significant Risk</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That the London 2012 Sustainability Group ensures that all healthy living commitments in the London 2012 Sustainability Plan are being actively monitored and progressed.

The London 2012 Sustainability report, produced in April 2011, included monitoring against all components of the Sustainability Plan, including healthy living.

**Progress made**

That LOCOG, the British Olympic Association and the British Paralympic Association maximise the legacy of the Get Set programme and find partners to achieve this.

The BOA is the inheritor of the GetSet programme and discussions are underway to ensure that it continues to be an effective youth engagement programme in legacy. The Commission believes this programme and International Inspiration sets a new bar for international outreach and engagement with young people for the IOC.

**Progress Made**

### 2010 Annual Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ODA LOCOG GLA GOE OPLC</td>
<td>That the London 2012 Sustainability Group should provide clear leadership over all aspects of sustainability (including health) and establish a mechanism to engage effectively with the SRO Group and Olympic Board</td>
<td>The Commission is still not seeing the rapid progress that is needed to ensure coordinated action is taken on health legacy issues despite previous recommendations in the review of Inclusion and Healthy Living and progress is still looked for. The Commission remains concerned that despite the excellent preparatory work the NHS is doing to embed healthy living locally, effective healthy living legacy policy may be being constrained due the altered focus on policy priorities. As such, there is a risk that the wider healthy living legacy may drop off the strategic agenda. <strong>Significant Risk</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 | ODA GOE | That the ODA, working with relevant government departments, gather evidence of the linkage between productivity, health, safety and sustainability and publish their findings as part of the learning legacy. | ODA and DEFRA commissioned some limited case studies but more evidence is needed to be gathered.

**Progress Made** |

| 6 | OPLC | That the OPLC confirm their commitment to maintain 45 hectares of habitat that can mature into a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) of at least Borough Grade 1 status and base their planning considerations on this assumption. | The OPLC has committed to providing the requisite habitat and the Commission looks forward to seeing detailed plans for how this will be delivered as we are aware that they are not able to meet it within the current plans.

**Progress Made** |

| 9 | OPLC | That the OPLC use the LMF protocol, developed in 2008, as a starting point for work to develop the sustainability objectives and plans for legacy and use the legacy column of the Towards a One Planet Olympics bid document – [http://assets.panda.org/downloads/opl_olympics_brochure.pdf](http://assets.panda.org/downloads/opl_olympics_brochure.pdf) | An environmental sustainability strategy focussed on the Park has now been produced by the OPLC and will shortly be published. The strategy is communications-focussed, giving character and alluding to a vision for 2030, and incorporates a set of key targets as well as a framework within which to consider them. The organisation has strengthened many of its aspirations and targets in recent months which is welcomed. The Commission is pleased that sustainable behaviour change is one of the key areas of focus and is aware that the organisation recognises the critical role behaviour change will play in embedding sustainability into people’s lives. The Commission is also pleased to see that the OPLC is committed to actively monitoring... |
and benchmarking sustainability performance in the early years so that longer term aspirations can be effectively set and that it will report publicly on its progress. The Commission commends the OPLC on producing the strategy, and urge the organisation to continue to drive for increasingly stringent aspirational goals over the longer term.

**Closed**

| 10 | GOE/GLA | That government and the GLA mandate certification to BS 8901 for all official events. | We have not yet seen any progress in Government mandating BS 8901 certification for official events. The GLA is considering how it could move certification from City Operations to the events team post-Games and intends to share experiences in sustainable events management across the GLA. It is not yet clear if they will mandate BS 8901 certification for official events. |

**No Evidence Yet**